FIRST RESEARCH OF ITS KIND

HISTORY OF NASS IMAMATE:

A CRITICAL STUDY

JOHN ANDALUSO



History of Naṣṣ Imamate:
A Critical Study

Written by:
John Andaluso

twitter.com/andaluso24
al-mumtahana.blogpost.com

In thawāb of a certain servant of al-Zahrā͗.

Introduction

Naṣṣ Imamate is a concept existent among Shīʿa Muslims of the Jaʿfarī strain, which today exists in the form of two main branches: IthnāʿAshariyya (the Twelvers) whom are the majority, and the Ismaʿīliyya.

Jaʿfarī Shīʿa differ from their Zaydī counterparts in that they do not believe that personal traits, such as propensity to revolt and scholarship, to determine whether a person is a divinely blessed Imām.

To the Jaʿfariyya, an Imām is a divinely appointed leader delegated with preserving the religion of Allāh from corruption through the special knowledge bestowed upon him by Allāh.

He only receives this special knowledge through succeeding a previous Imām who had this knowledge.

This is akin to Prophet Sulaymān inheriting the prophetic knowledge of Prophet Dāwūd - after Dāwūd's death, in addition to Dāwūd's kingship and rank.

"And Solomon inherited David. He said, 'O people, we have been taught the language of birds, and we have been given from all things. Indeed, this is evident bounty.'"(Qurʾān27:16)

Therefore, the Imām may be completely non-revolutionary. Yet, this would not reduce his legitimacy in the eyes of the people - as his legitimacy is derived solely from the fact he is divinely appointed.

Secondary characteristics such as bravery and personal scholarship do not determine an Imām - in Jaʿfarī thought.

As a concept, the idea of 'Naṣṣ Imamate' features prominently in early Islamic history - even in Shīʿī non-Jaʿfarī contexts.

The historian Ibn Saʿd says regarding Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn 'Abbās, founder of the Abbasid revolutionary movement which overthrew the Umayyads:

"Abū Hāshim - ʿAbdullāh son of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya - gave his will to (Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī) and gave him his books (as proof of his Imamate)

'This matter (divine rulership) will be in your children'"

قال ابن سعد كان أبو هاشم عبد الله بن محمد ابن الحنفية أوصى إليه ودفع إليه كتبه .وقال له هذا الأمر في ولدك وقال أبو هاشم لا أعلم أحدا أعلم منه ولا خيرا منه[1]

---

[1]Al-Ṭabaqātal-Kubrā, volume 9, page 193

The success of the Abbasid movement came on them claiming NaṣṣImamate from the 2nd Imām of the Kaysāniya movement, Abū Hāshim, who himself was willed the Imamate by his father Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya.

Logically, this would make sense:

Would people be more likely to follow you if they believe God chose you and you are infallible? Or if they believe the people chose you and you are fallible? The former of course.

Hence, the Ancient Egyptians and so many ancient civilizations claimed to be descended from gods and that they (pharaohs and kings) are also half-gods of sort.

Hence, the Imāmiyya in the times of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq engaged in public debates and wrote books intended for public reading - all to prove the idea of *Naṣṣ Imamate.*

In his Fihrist, Arab bibliographer Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 990 CE) records a companion of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam - who himself (i.e, Hishām) was a companion of Imām al-Ṣādiq - by the name of Muḥammad b.Jalīl al-Sakkāk.

Al-Sakkāk authored one of the first books proving Naṣṣ-based Imamate.

Ibn al-Nadīm described al-Sakkākas a “mutakalim” and companion of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam who disagreed with him in some things, except the Imāmah as one of Uṣūlal-Dīn.

One of al-Sakkāk’s books that Ibn al-Nadīm mentions is

كتاب على من أبى وجوب الإمامة بالنص

The book title translated to English, it would be “*Book Against Those Who Deny that the Imamate Must Necessarily be Established by Naṣṣ”*.[2]

Being so, there have been Sunnīpolemicists who deny that NaṣṣImamate formed the core tenet of the early Shīʿa, or was among their beliefs.

The prominent Sunnī fatwa website, IslamQA, says regarding the early Shīʿa:

“The early Shīʿa asserted the virtue of AbūBakr and ʿUmar, and their precedence over the rest of the Ṣaḥāba.

[2] Al-Fihrist, page 250

And it was not known of them what was known of the Shīʿa who came after - from insulting the Ṣaḥāba and falsely accusing them, in addition to doing takfīrand tafsīq of them (i.e, labelling them as kāfir and fāsiq).”

كان الشيعة الأولون يقرون لأبي بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما بالفضل والتقدم على سائر الصحابة رضي الله عنهم ، ولم يكن يعرف عنهم ما هو معروف عن متأخريهم من سب . الصحابة والطعن فيهم ، فضلا عن تكفيرهم وتفسيقهم
[3]

Not only is the idea that the early Shīʿa did not do takfīrand insult the Ṣaḥāba completely false, as will be shown in section 3 of this book.

However, the author of the above statement is also attempting to show that the early Shīʿa were part of the general community of ‘Muslims’ (i.e, that they did not differ from Sunnis in aqīda).

Some Orientalist scholars developed similar thoughts to this regarding the early Shīʿa.

Prominent Islamic studies academic, Marshall Hodgson, in his book, *How did the Shi’a Become Sectarian,* argues that the conception of Naṣṣ Imamate is a later innovation

[3] https://islamqa.info/amp/ar/answers/219169

in Shīʿī thought which was superimposed onto early Shi'ism by the later Twelvers.

His idea of early Shi'ism was that of the Zaydis, that "*there would have been no question in particular of anyone succeeding him [i.e, Imām Zayn Al-ʿĀbidīn] - as the Imamate was not hereditary*." **[4]**

These questions and claims have inspired me to write a book highlighting the historicity of Naṣṣ Imamate and all that it entails of special knowledge and traits inherited by the Imāms such as infallibility and ʿIlm al-Ghayb (knowledge of the unseen).

Not only this, but I will also strive to prove that the Twelver Imāms were divinely appointed - and that they considered themselves to be Imāms (per the Twelver conception).

In doing so, I will make use in this book of numerous posts I've written on Twitter previously in my account "**Andaluso24**" - to help for this research. In addition - of course, to other research I've carried out but have never published or did not put into writing.

---

[4] How Did the Early Shi'a Become Sectarian, page 1

In writing this book, I would like to to give special thanks to the dearest person to my heart, a certain Slave of al-Zahrāʾ - who has been a source of constant inspiration for me to serve the cause of Ahl al-Bayt (AS) and being close to them.

This person has made me develop a connection to the Ahl al-Bayt, beyond what I could ever have expected. My vigor to understand the Ahl al-Bayt only increases day by day now, because of this person. May Allāh bless them endlessly - and to them, I dedicate this book.

May Allāh also bless all the brothers who have encouraged me and given their insight on the book. throughout the process - namely, brothers Aws and Mahdi.

And may Allāh also bless the members of the ALB group chat on Twitter, and everyone who has wished me well and encouraged me to write this book.

May Allāh bless you all.

We begin this book by saying:

“Bismillāhar-Raḥmānar-Raḥīm.

In the name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.”

Belief in Naṣṣ Imamate

1. Imām ʿAlī (around 232 AH / 846 CE):

The following ḥadīth narrated in Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī, a compilation of aḥādīth by Muḥammad al-Bukhārī completed in 846 CE (232 AH).

"Narrated al-Aswad:

It was mentioned in the presence of ʿĀʾisha that the Prophet (ﷺ) had appointed ʿAlī as successor by will. *Thereupon she said, 'Who said so? I saw the Prophet, while I was supporting him against my chest. He asked for a tray, and then fell on one side and expired, and I did not feel it. So how (do the people say) he appointed ʿAlī as his successor?'"*

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ، أَخْبَرَنَا أَزْهَرُ، أَخْبَرَنَا ابْنُ عَوْنٍ، عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، عَنِ الأَسْوَدِ، قَالَ ذُكِرَ عِنْدَ عَائِشَةَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم أَوْصَى إِلَى عَلِيٍّ، فَقَالَتْ مَنْ قَالَهُ لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَإِنِّي لَمُسْنِدَتُهُ إِلَى صَدْرِي، فَدَعَا بِالطَّسْتِ فَانْخَنَثَ فَمَاتَ، فَمَا شَعَرْتُ، فَكَيْفَ أَوْصَى إِلَى عَلِيٍّ[5]

Evaluation(A):

[5]Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī 4459 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:4459

This Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī ḥadīth, which is corroborated in other *ṭuruq* in Bukhārī[6] and Sunan Ibn Māja[7]- among other corpuses, suggests that *appointment by divine will (Naṣṣ)* was known in ʿĀʾisha's lifetime. In other words, before ʿĀʾisha's death in 678 CE and before the rise of the followers of al-Mukhtār and the Kaysāniya who emerged during and after the 680s CE.

While ʿĀʾisha does deny that ʿAlī was appointed in such a manner by the Prophet, it does indicate that there were people who had such a belief.

What will is the ḥadīth referring to?

One possibility is that divine will is perhaps referring to the 'Hadith of Pen and Paper' mentioned in Bukhārī

*"Ibn ʿAbbās said, 'When the ailment of the Prophet (ﷺ) became worse, he said, '**Bring for me (writing) paper and I will write for you a statement after which you will not go astray.'"***

The companions, particularly ʿUmar, were opposed to the Prophet writing a document on the pretense of the Prophet being delirious or in pain.

And as such, ʿUmar argued the Qurʾān is enough as a guide for Muslims to not go astray after the Prophet's

[6]Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī 2741 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:2741
[7]Sunan Ibn Māja, Book 6, Ḥadīth 1694 https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah/6/194

death. Thus, the Prophet’s written statement is not necessary.

*“When Allāh’s Messenger (ﷺ) was on his death-bed and in the house there were some people among whom was ʿUmaribnal-Khaṭṭāb, the Prophet (ﷺ) said, ‘Come, let me write for you a statement after which you will not go astray.’ ʿUmar said, ‘***The Prophet (ﷺ) is seriously ill and you have the Qurʾān; so the Book of Allāh is enough for us.’ The people present in the house differed and quarrelled.”*** [8]

Regardless, some of the companions went near the Prophet to get the written statement from him

“Some said, ‘Go near so that the Prophet (ﷺ) may write for you a statement after which you will not go astray,’ while the others said as ʿUmar said.”[9]

The Prophet’s answer and his will is recorded in the following Bukhārīḥadīth.

“The Prophet (ﷺ) said, ‘Leave me, for my present state is better than what you call me for.’ *Then he ordered them to do three things. He said, ‘Turn the pagans out of the Arabian Peninsula; respect and give gifts to the foreign delegations as you have seen me dealing with*

[8]Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 114 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:114
[9]Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 5569 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/75/30

*them.'"(*SaʿīdibnJubayr, the sub-narrator said ***that Ibn ʿAbbās kept quiet as regards the third order, or he said, "I forgot it."***)[10]

The 'third order' may have been the greatest order, ʿAlī's appointment as the Prophet's waṣī. Hence, the belief of the group which in ʿĀʾisha's presence stated the Prophet appointed ʿAlī by will.

But conveniently, the narrator of the ḥadīth either "forgot" the third order or Ibn ʿAbbās kept quiet on it, anyways I digress.

A written document in favor of ʿAlī's succession simply would reiterate - from a Shīʿī perspective - the idea that the Prophet appointed ʿAlī as his successor, which took place at Ghadīr Khumm.

A written document is only one of the several shapes in which Naṣṣ takes place.

In *al-Amālī* by Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, Imām al-Ṣādiq states that the Prophet willed a written document to Imām ʿAlī specifically:

"Allāh sent down a kitāb (document) upon the Prophet before his death. So he [Gabriel, through whom Allāh sent the book] told the Prophet:

[10]Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī 4431 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:4431

*‘O Muḥammad, this kitāb is **your will** to the najīb (noble one) from your household.’*

So he [the Prophet] asked: ‘Who is the najīb from my household, O Gabriel?’

He [Gabriel] said: ‘ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib’”[11]

The written document was dedicated to Imām ʿAlī.

However, the Prophet - out of his emotional empathy with even the kāfir - wanted to write a document for all the Ṣaḥāba so they never again are astray.

But as Allāh reminds the Prophet regarding the kuffār’s guidance:

“Indeed, [O Muḥammad], you do not guide whom you like, but Allāh guides whom He wills.” (Qurʾān 28:56)

And Allāh reminds the Prophet regarding the Ṣaḥāba:

*“So fight, [O Muḥammad], in the cause of Allāh; **you are not held responsible except for yourself”***
(Qurʾān4:84)

And as we know in *Āyat al-Mubāhala,* the Prophet’s “self” is Imām ʿAlī. The only one whom truly matters when the Prophet wills a written document is Imām ʿAlī.

---

[11] Shaykh al-Ṣadūq al-Amālī, 486
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1134_الأمالي-الشيخ-الصدوق/الصفحة_484

And the Prophet wrote a will for him as discussed in the *al-Amālī* ḥadīth above.

Therefore, the Prophet only wrote the document for the Ṣaḥāba when a group of non-defiant Ṣaḥāba approached and pressed him to write the document. And the defiant ones left the house.

And from then on, the written will spread to the generalities of Muslims in which the Muslims who believed the Prophet willed ʿAlī as his successor had their belief originated.

Evaluation (B):

The mere fact the Prophet even *intended* to write a will regarding Imām ʿAlī, not to mention write the will.

It gives Imām ʿAlī's succession divine legitimacy, as the Prophet does not act with regards to religion out of mere desire, but out of divine instructions.

Hence, ʿĀʾisha mentions the following ḥadīth.
In Ṣahīḥ Muslim, ʿĀʾisha says that the Prophet intended to write a written document willing Abū Bakr as his successor because he feared someone else may claim it and there is no better claim to it than Abū Bakr:

"ʿĀʾisha reported that Allāh's Messenger (ﷺ) in his (last) illness asked me to call Abū Bakr, her father, and her brother too, so that he might write a document, for he

*feared that someone else might be desirous (of succeeding him) and that some claimant may say:**I have better claim to it**, whereas Allāh and the Faithful do not substantiate the claim of anyone but that of Abū Bakr.”* [12]

The Prophet, merely intending to write the will - shows that the will of Allāh is that AbūBakr become caliph.

Even if in the Hadith of Pen and Paper, the Prophet wrote the document after being pressed by the non-defiant Ṣaḥāba.

The mere fact he was going to write the document shows he was only going to write what is the Will of Allāh.

It is evident that from the Prophet’s death, the idea of succession to him by Naṣṣ (divine will) was wholly intrinsic to legitimizing succession from Prophet Muḥammad.

2. Imām ʿAlī (Before 354 AH / 965 CE)

Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354 AH / 965 CE), one of the foremost classical Sunnī muḥaddithūn had authored a book by the name of ‘*Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn’,* a biographical evaluation of ḥadīth unreliable ḥadīth narrators.

He mentions a man by the name of ‘Umara ibn Juwayn, and says regarding him:

---

[12]Ṣahīḥ Muslim 2387 https://sunnah.com/muslim/44/12

“ʿUmāra ibn Juwayn: Abū Hārūn al-ʿAbdī. He narrates from Abī Saʿīd al-Khudrī, and [Sufyān] al-Thawrī narrated from him.

He was a Rāfiḍī who narrated from Abī Saʿīd what he [Abī Saʿīd] did not not say. It is not permissible to write down his aḥādīth, except in amazement [at its falsehood].

Al-Ḥanbalī told us:

I heard Aḥmad ibn Zuhayr, narrate from Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn who said:

*Abū Harūn al-ʿAbdī had a scripture and he said this scripture is the ‘Scripture of the **Waṣī** [i.e, holder of the divine will / Waṣiyya]. He meant ʿAlī.’”*

عمارة بن جوين: أبو هارون العبدي ، يروى عن أبي سعيد الخدري روى عنه الثوري، كان رافضيا يروى عن أبي سعيد ما ليس من حديثه، ل يحل كتابة حديثه إل على جهة التعجب، أخبرنا الحنبلي قال: سمعت أحمد بن زهير عن يحيى بن معي قال. أبو هارون العبدي كانت عنده صحيفة يقول هذه الصحيفة صحيفة الوصي. يعنى عليا. [13]

Brief evaluation:

Ibn Ḥibbān’s statement suggests that ‘Umāra was a contemporary of Abī Saʿīd al-Khudrī who lied about Abī

[13] Kitab al-Majruheen, volume 2, page 177
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3102_كتاب-المجروحين-ابن-حبان-ج-٢/الصفحة_176

Saʿīd. This means that ʿUmāra was alive before 693 CE (Abī Saʿīd's death).

And the fact that al-Thawrī narrates from him, makes it likely he died during the lifetime of Imām al-Bāqir.

He narrates from Abī Saʿīd al-Khudrī in Shīʿī sources, and figures reported in rijālī sources to be ghulāt such as Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Ruqqī narrates from him.**[14]**

Given this corroborating evidence (Sunnī sources refer to him as a Rāfiḍī, one shouldn't write his aḥādīth except in amazement, and Shīʿī ghulāt narrating from him) - it is likely that ʿUmāra's idea of Imām ʿAlī as the 'Waṣī' was of Imamite conception. And his 'Scripture of al-Waṣī' most likely referred to aḥādīth pertaining to Imām ʿAlī which he had gathered, and which the ghulātamong the Imāmiyya such as Dāwūd ibn Kathīr narrated from.

3. Imām al-Ḥasan (around 200 AH / 815 CE)

The Muʿtazilī theologian *Jaʿfar ibn Ḥarb* (d. 236 AH / 850 CE) has a book called *Masāʾil al-Imāmah*, which is still extant, where the views of the early Imāmiyya and their belief that Imām ʿAlī willed the Imamate to his son Ḥasan.

"*A portion of Shīʿa affirmed his death [i.e, Imām ʿAlī, instead of believing he went to ghayba].* ***And they***

---

[14] ʿIlm Rijāl al-Ḥadīth by ʿAlīal-Shāhrūdī al-Namāzī, vol 6, page 17 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/2989_مستدركات-علم-رجال-الحديث-الشيخ-علي-النمازي-الشاهرودي-ج-٦/الصفحة_17

claimed the Imām after him is al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī, and they claimed the Prophet willed the Imamate to him just like he willed the Imamate to his father (ʿAlī).

These [group of Shīʿa] are the ones who believe in the system of Imāmah and the mass transmission of the waṣiyya [divine will, to ascertain that Imamate]. They say there must an Imām after each Imām, a waṣī [holder of a waṣiyya] after waṣī - until the end of Dunyā.

And they claimed that the Prophet gave Naṣṣ [i.e, he willed] to ʿAlī designating every Imām after him from his lineage until the Day of Judgement - with their names and traits. *And the Imamate is in motion with them today per the Naṣṣ of the Prophet.*

And a portion of ʿAlī's companions spoke about this, among them: al-Ḥārith al-Aʿwar, al-Aṣbagh ibn Nabātah, and ʿAbd Khayr.

فرقة قطعوا على موته وزعموا أن الامام بعده الحسن بن علي، وزعموا

أن النبي(ص) قد نص على إمامته، كما نص على إمامة أبيه،

وهؤلاء الذين يدينون بنسق الامامة وتواتر الوصية، يقولون لابد

بعد كل إمام من إمام، وبعد كل وصي من وصي إلى أن تفنى الدنيا،

زعموا أن النبي(ص) قد نص لعلي على كل إمام يكون بعده من ولده إلى يوم

القيامة بأسمائهم وصفاتهم، فالامامة تجري اليوم عندهم على ما نص عليه

النبي(ص)منهم (ع) ، وقد حكى هذا القول جماعة من أصحاب علي

الحارث الأعور، والأصبغ بن نباتة، وعبد خير[15]

Evaluation:

The author of this statement appears elsewhere in his book to be a contemporary of Imām al-Riḍā, describing the state of the Imāmiyya until that time period.

In his statement, he describes a group of Shīʿa believing several crucial aspects:

(1) The Prophet had appointed Imām ʿAlī by Naṣṣ.

(2) The Naṣṣ of Imām ʿAlī to al-Ḥasan, was considered a Naṣṣ by the Prophet himself.

(3) The Imamate will never end until the Day of Judgement.

(4) The Prophet informed Imām ʿAlī of the names and traits of all Imāms coming after him.

(5) Several companions of Imām ʿAlī, such as al-Hārith al-Aʿwar and al-Aṣbagh ibn Nabātah, whom are reported in Sunnī rijālī sources as "Rāfiḍa ghulāt", are reported to have stated this.

---

[15]Masāʾil al-Imāmah, page 22-23. Quoted here: https://books.google.com/books?id=SSlHDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA234&lpg=PA234

Thus, indicating the idea of the Prophet informing Imām ʿAlī of the names of all Imāms that will come after him is not a later fabrication. But rather, it existed in at least 815 CE and it is plausible to assume that the close companions of Imām ʿAlī were aware of such an idea.

This may serve to corroborate the following al-Kāfī ḥadīth- with regards to the idea, that the identity of Imām ʿAlī's heirs were known by the Prophet, and he shared this knowledge with other infallibles (such as Sayyida Fāṭima below):

*"Jābir said: 'I swear by Allāh, Whom there is no god other than, that I had come to your mother Fāṭima (as) when the Prophet (S) was alive to congratulate her for the birth of al-Ḥusayn (as) and I found a green tablet in her hand. I thought it was of emerald. It had a white writing like the light of the sun.' I said to her: 'My father and mother may be sacrificed for you! What is this tablet?' She said:**'This tablet has been gifted by Allāh the Almighty to His messenger (as). It has the names of my father, my husband, my two sons and the names of the awṣiyāʾ[holders of the waṣiyya / divine will] from my progeny].'"***[16]

4. Imām ʿAlī to al-Bāqir (before 845 CE)

[16] Al-Kāfī, volume 1, page 527 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1122_الكافي-ج-١/الصفحة_0?pageno=527#top

Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd (d. 845 CE) is the most famous and widely known work of Muḥammad ibn Saʿd al-Baghdādī. It is widely used by Sunnī scholars as it is both a historical and religious work, matching the criteria of Ahl al-Sunnah in its compilation of aḥādīth.

In Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd, the narrator Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq (d. 160 AH/776 CE) tells us:

"*I asked ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī (ibn al-Ḥusayn) and Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (al-Ḥusayn), uncles of Jaʿfar (al-Ṣādiq). I said:*

'Is there among you Ahl al-Bayt a human whose obedience is obligatory.

And you know that of him, and whomever did not know that of him dies the death of the Days of Jāhiliyya (ignorance)?'

They said: 'No, by God, this is not a trait of us. And whomever says this about us (Ahl al-Bayt) is a liar'."

"I asked ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī:

'May Allāh have mercy on you. This (Imāmah) is a status you claim belonged to ʿAlī - as the Prophet willed it to him. After that it was to Ḥasan, after ʿAlī willed to him. After that it was to Ḥusayn, after al-Ḥasan willed it to him. After that it belonged to ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, after al-Ḥusayn willed it to him. And after that it was to Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, after ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn willed it to him.'

So he (ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn said):

'By God, my father had died and did not will even two letters'

'May Allāh fight them! (The ones making this claim)

They are only taking advantage of (our names).

This is [the product] of Khunays the defilement'

ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn said: 'Who is Khunays the defilement?'

He (Fuḍayl) said: 'Al-Muʿallā ibn Khunays'

ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn replied: 'Yes, al-Muʿallā ibn Khunays. By God, when I'm in bed I think for a long time amazed by a people God took away their minds when al-Muʿalā ibn Khunays misguided them.'"

سألت عمر بن علي وحسين بن علي عمي جعفر قلت هل فيكم أهل البيت إنسان مفترضة طاعته تعرفون له ذلك ومن لم يعرف له ذلك فمات ماتمية جاهلية فقالا لا والله ما هذا فينا من قال هذا فينا فهو كذاب قال فقلت لعمر بن علي رحمك اله إن هذه منزلة تزعمون أنها كانت لعلي إن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أوصى إليه ثم كانت للحسن إن عليا أوصى إليه ثم كانت للحسين إن الحسن أوصى إليه ثم كانت لعلي بن الحسين إن الحسين أوصى إليه ثم كانت لمحمد بن علي إن عليا أوصى إليه فقال والله لمات أبي فما أوصى بحرفين قاتلهم الله والله إن هؤلاء إلا متأكلون بنا هذا خنيس الخرؤ ما خنيس الخرؤ قال قلت المعلى بن خنيس قال نعم المعلى بن خنيس والله لفكرت على فراشي طويلا أتعجب من قوم لبس الله عقولهم حين أضلهم المعلى بن خنيس [17]

Evaluation:

[17] Al-Ṭabaqātal-Kubrā, volume 5, page 325 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3048_الطبقات-الكبرى-محمد-بن-سعد-ج-٥/الصفحة_323

Several aspects can be established from this report:

1) The word ‘human’ is used, instead of ‘man’ رجل. When the word ‘human’ is used in for example the Qurʾān - it always refers to the intrinsic nature of man.

This suggests that when ‘human’ is used in this report, it refers to the intrinsic nature of men from the Ahl al-Bayt.

What nature is intrinsic to them?

One to whom obedience is obligatory.

Such that, whoever did not know that of him dies the death of the Days of Jāhiliyya (ignorance)?

This suggests the report is referring to the belief these men from Ahl al-Bayt are supernatural beings who exist for us to obey them. Without which, we will die the death of Jāhiliyya.

2) The idea of an Imamate by divine will going from Imām ʿAlī, to al-Ḥasan, to al-Ḥusayn, to ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, to al-Bāqir - existed when Ṭabaqāt Ibn Saʿd was published before his death in 845 CE.

And when taking upon the narration, this suggests the idea existed in the 700s CE during the lifetime of Imām al-Bāqir.

3) Al-Muʿallā ibn Khunays - who is referred to in this ḥadīth - was the chief deputy and financial administrator of Imām al-Ṣādiq.

He had too much passion and love for the Imām, to the extent he was spreading the Imām's Shīʿī ideology publicly despite orders by the Imām to desist to avoid harming Imām al-Ṣādiq's daʿwah movement.

There are many aḥādīth in al-Kāfī where Imām al-Ṣādiq admonishes al-Muʿallā for not partaking in the taqiyya the Imām ordered him. The following ḥadīth in al-Kāfī is an example:

"*Once Abāʿ Abdillāh [al-Ṣādiq] said to me:*

'O Muʿallā, conceal our cause and do not make it public*. To those who conceal our cause and do not publicize it, Allāh grants honor in this world. He will make a light between his eyes in the next life and lead him to paradise.*
O Muʿallā, whoever publicizes our cause does not conceal it, Allāh humiliates him in this world*, removes the light between his eyes in the next life and will make darkness for him to enter fire.*

*O Muʿallā, **Taqiyya** is my religion and the religion of my predecessors. There is no religion for one who does not partake in Taqiyya.*

O Muʿallā, Allāh loves to be worshipped secretly, just as He loves to be worshipped publicly. O Muʿallā, one who publicizes our cause is like one who rejects it altogether.”[18]

This may explain why Imām al-Ṣādiq’s uncles vehemently denied the beliefs of al-Muʿallā when confronted by the Mukhālifīn.

5. Imām ʿAlī to al-Bāqir (before 246 AH / 860 CE)

Al-Qāsim ibn Ibrahīm al-Rassī was a Zaydī Imām who lived in 9th century CE Medina. He was a contemporary of Imām ʿAlī al-Hādī, and in fact criticized him in his letter of response against the Rāfiḍa, entitled *‘al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa’* - as will be shown later in this book

In the beginning of ***al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa***, al-Rassī emphasizes the shared Imāms between Zaydis and Imamites (proto-Twelvers), and criticizes their belief in Imāms after al-Bāqir.

Al-Rassī says:

[18] http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1202_وسائل-الشيعة-آل-البيت-الحر-العاملي-ج-١٦/الصفحة_235

“So understand [O Rāfiḍa] and look, ***has there ever been a difference between us [in the Imamate] of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib?***

And after him in al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī?

And after him in al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī?

Have we differed in Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī [al-Bāqir]?”

Al-Rassī then goes on to repeat his point, on the same page - saying:

“*Has anyone appeared from among the prophets or Imāms or dāʿīs to Allāh -* ***such as ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, or Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī - and others whom called to Allāh and we did not differ on them being Imāms? And Allāh awarded them that status?***

Had they asked people what they did not deserve from people’s money?

Had they publicized disobedience by the cover of ***taqiyya****? To protect themselves, and out of fear of their blood being shed?”*[19]

Evaluation:

[19]Majmūʿ Rasāʾil al-Qāsim al-Rassī, al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa, page 554

It is evident that the Zaydī Imām saw shared points with the Rāfiḍa on several Imāms - such ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī.

It is worth noting that ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn and Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī are not recognized as Imāms by the Zaydiyya today.

Additionally, al-Rassī mentions "others whom called to Allāh and we did not differ on them being Imāms" - after speaking of Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī being a shared Imām with the Rāfiḍa.

The figure al-Rassī was referring to by "others whom called to Allāh" perhaps refers to Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, or al-Kāẓim - whom the Zaydiyya refer to claim were in fact rebellious leaders.

Al-Rassī was not the only one to recognize some of the later Twelver Imāms as ZaydīImāms. Later Zaydī Imāms recognized ImāmʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā as an Imām, as evident by the testimony of their Imām al-Manṣūr BillāhʿAbdullāh ibn Ḥamza (d. 1217 CE):

"*We [the Zaydiyya] and Ban ūal-ʿAbbās were in consensus of the Imamate of ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā. And we did not differ in that, nor did they."*

"When he [ʿAlī ibn Mūsā] died, we expressed extreme grievance. His grave is near his father, out of love and fairness.

Hārūn’s grave was built - and ʿAlī ibn Mūsā was not in it. And the mausoleum [of Hārūn] was attributed to ʿAlī ibn Mūsāal-Riḍā. And no one knows Hārūn is in fact buried there except the people of understanding.”

وعلى أنا قد أجمعنا نحن وبنو العباس على إمامة علي بن موسى الرضا عليه السلام ، ولم نختلف في ذلك نحن ولا هم ، انتهى . قال المنصور بالله عليه السلام : ولما مات أظهر جزعا عظيما ، وقبره إلى جنب أبيه توددا وإظهارا للإنصاف ، فغبي قبر هارون حتى كأنه لم يكن هناك ، ونسب المشهد إلى علي بن موسيالرضى ، فلا يعرف أن هناك هارون إلا أهل المعرفة ، وهكذا ينبغي أن يكون الحق والباطل ، وإلا فالدولة العباسية إلى الآن ، ومنشأ الدعوة العباسية خراسان ، فصغر الله الباطل ، وعظم الح[20]

With that said, there are intrinsic differences between how the ZaydīImām viewed those shared Imāms with the Rāfiḍa, and how the Rāfiḍa themselves viewed them.

He cites numerous crucial points of dichotomy and contention between the Rāfiḍī and Zaydī conception of Imamate, particularly with regards to the following points:

1. The Rāfiḍa believe their Imāms receive waḥy (divine inspiration from Allāh)

“If you [Rāfiḍa] claim there exists on Earth today a person who receives waḥy, then you are claiming he is a prophet, as waḥy is only suitable for a prophet.”

---

[20]Kitāb al-Shāfī by al-Manṣūr Billāh, volume 2

فإن زعمتم ان في الارض اليوم من يوحى اليه فقد زعمتم انه نبي، لانالوحي لا يكون الا لنبي[21]

2. The Rāfiḍa’s belief that their Imāms had knowledge of al-Ghayb:

“*Allāh has informed that no one has knowledge of al-Ghayb except prophets.. so how would anyone have knowledge of al-Ghayb except through waḥy of Allāh [which is only rewarded to prophets?”*

فقد أخبر بأن لا يعلم الغيب إلا الله ومن ارتضى من رسول. فكيف يعلم أحد الغيب من غير وحي الله عز وجل؟[22]

3. The Imām can view his Shīʿa from a distance, and that he and the Shīʿa will return to Dunyā before the Day of Judgement (a process known as ‘Rajʿa’ or *The Return*).

“He [the Imām] views our status, actions, and deeds. He hears our speech, and tells us that we will return to Dunyā after our deaths.”

يرى حالنا واعمالنا وافعالنا، ويسمع كلمنا، ويخبرنا انا نرجع للدنيا بعد موتنا[23]

---

[21]Majmūʿ Rasāʾil al-Qāsim al-Rassī, al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa, page 562

[22] Ibid, Page 562
[23] Ibid Page 562

6. Imām al-Bāqir to al-Kāẓim (before 329 AH / 941 CE)

Abū Muḥammad al-Barbahārī (d. 329 AH/941 CE) was the pre-eminent Ḥanbalite scholar of Baghdad during an era that corresponded to al-Ghayba al-Ṣughrā. This would mean he would naturally come across the Rāfiḍa of his time period, who became quite visible during the early 900s CE - at a time of weakness of the Abbasids and rise of Shīʿī viziers such as the Banū al-Furāt.

His views on the Rāfiḍa would thus be crucial to have an idea of the defining beliefs of the Imāmiyya during this important era. These views are recorded in al-Barbahārī's Sharḥ al-Sunnah:

"*An innovation which equals disbelief in the Almighty Allāh appeared, and whomever believes in it is a disbeliever without doubt.*

[That being] whomever believes in Rajʿa and says ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib is alive and will return on Day of Judgement.

And [also] Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī and Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad and Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar (will return to Dunyā through Rajʿa)

And they [i.e, the Rāfiḍa] speak of Imamate, and that [their] Imāms have knowledge of al-Ghayb.

Then beware of them, as they are disbelievers in the Almighty Allāh".

وبدعة ظهرت هي كفر بالله العظيم ومن قال بها فهو كافر بالله لا شك فيه من يؤمن بالرجعة ويقول علي بن أبي طالب حي وسيرجع قبل يوم القيامة ومحمد بن علي وجعفر بن محمد وموسى بن جعفر ويتكلمون في الإمامة وأنهم يعلمون الغيب فاحذرهم فإنهم كفار بالله العظيم[24]

Evaluation:

The aforementioned statement by al-Barbahārī is very significant. Given that al-Barbahārī lived in Baghdad, where is where the deputy (safīr) of Imām al-Mahdī lived may give an indication that the religious knowledge al-Barbahārī mentions of the generalities among the Rāfiḍa was taught by the safīr himself.

These early Rāfiḍa had an established concept of Imamate - as al-Barbahārī clarifies, and the fact that he mentions al-Bāqir, al-Ṣādiq, and al-Kāẓim will return to Dunyā as part of Rajʿa suggests the Rāfiḍa believed those Imāms succeeded each other one by one. This indicates a succession in Imamate by Naṣṣ.

---

[24]Sharh al-Sunnah by al-Burhari, Ḥadīth 123

Al-Barbahārī then highlights that Rāfiḍa believed these Imāms were supernatural, that they did not truly die off (as al-Barbahārī states the Rāfiḍa believed their Imāms were alive and will come back before the Day of Judgement).

This statement shows al-Barbahārī's misunderstanding of the concept of al-Rajʿa, in which the Imāms do experience a physical death but they are simply resurrected when the Mahdī emerges (before the Day of Judgement).

Al-Barbahārī then ends his statement by going on to show another important facet crucial to the Rāfiḍa's belief in Imamate, in that they believed their Imāms had knowledge of al-ghayb (the unseen).

7. Imām ʿAlī to al-Ṣādiq (before 365 AH / 976 CE)

ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAdī (d. 365 AH / 976 CE) is one of the most prominent classical Sunnī scholars of ʿIlm al-Rijāl (biographical evaluations of ḥadīth narrators). He wrote a book, *al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾal-Rijāl,* dedicated to identifying weak narrators and why they were weakened.

One of those weakened by him is Jābir al-Juʿfī, a foremost companion of Imām al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq.

The following reports highlight Jābir's belief in Naṣṣ Imamate (and the divine knowledge transmitted by it), which was a major reason in him being weakened by Sunnī scholars:

1- “*I heard Ibn ʿUyayna say:*

I left the aḥādīth of Jābir al-Juʿfī and whatever I heard from me, as he used to say:

‘Rasūl Allāh brought ʿAlī to teach him his [divine] knowledge. Then ʿAlī brought al-Ḥasan to teach him his [divine knowledge]. Then al-Ḥasan invited al-Ḥusayn to teach him his [divine knowledge], until this [knowledge] reached Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad’.

سمعت ابن عيينة يقول تركت جابر الجعفي وما سمعت منه قال دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عليا يعلمه ما يعلمه ثم دعا علي الحسن فعلمه ما يعلم (1) ثم دعا الحسن الحسين فعلمه ما يعلم (1) حتى بلغ جعفر بن محمد[25]

2- “*I heard Sufyān al-Thawrī say:*

I heard Jābir al-Juʿfī say:

‘[Divine] knowledge that was in the Prophet was transmitted to ʿAlī, then from ʿAlī it was transmitted to al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, until it reached Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad’

سمعت سفيان الثوري يقول سمعت جابر الجعفي يقول انتقل العلم الذي كان

[25] Al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾal-Rijāl, volume 2, page 115 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3106_الكامل-ج-٢/الصفحة_0?pageno=115

في النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى علي ثم انتقل من علي إلى الحسين بن علي ثم لم يزل حتى بلغ جعفر بن محمد[26]

Evaluation:

Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Juʿfī was one of the companions of Imām al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, is heavily praised in Shīʿī biographical descriptions of him.

Al-Shaykh al-Mufīd describes him as being as part of the Imām's companions who are:

"*They are the fuqahāʾ[jurists] of the companions of Abī Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] and Abī ʿAbdillāh[al-Ṣādiq], peace be upon him.*

And they are the prominent leaders whom the ruling of ḥalāl and ḥarām can be taken from, in addition to fatwas and commandments.

There is no condemnation against them, and a not single route of condemnation against them. They are the authors of the written uṣūl (ḥadīth books narrated directly from Imāms) and the famous books."

[26] ʿAdī,Al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Rijāl, volume 2, page 115 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3106_الكامل-ج-٢/الصفحة_0?pageno=115

وصفه: بأنهم فقهاء أصحاب أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله عليهما السلام، والاعلام والرؤساء الأخوذ منهم الحلال والحرام، والفتيا والاحكام، الذين لا مطعن عليهم، ولا طريق إلى ذم واحد منهم، وهم أصحاب ألصول الدونة، والصنفاتالشهورة.

27

This reputation extended to Sunnī circles, as Sufyān al-Thawrī says, as mentioned in Ṣahīḥ Muslim (17):

“Salamah ibn Shabīb narrated to me, al-Ḥumaydī narrated to us, Sufyān narrated to us, he said:

‘The people would transmit from Jābir before there appeared what appeared, then when there appeared what appeared, the people imputed him in his Ḥadīth and some of the people abandoned him’. So it was said to [Sufyān]: ‘What appeared?’ [Sufyān] said: ‘Belief in ar-Rajʿa’.

وَحَدَّثَنِي سَلَمَةُ بْنُ شَبِيبٍ، حَدَّثَنَا الْحُمَيْدِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ، قَالَ كَانَ النَّاسُ يَحْمِلُونَ عَنْ جَابِرٍ، قَبْلَ أَنْ يُظْهِرَ، مَا أَظْهَرَ فَلَمَّا أَظْهَرَ مَا أَظْهَرَ اتَّهَمَهُ النَّاسُ فِي حَدِيثِهِ وَتَرَكَهُ بَعْضُ النَّاسِ فَقِيلَ لَهُ وَمَا أَظْهَرَ قَالَ الإِيمَانَ بِالرَّجْعَةِ [28].

Jābir had an excellent reputation in proto-Sunnī circles, such that the Mukhālifīn would take upon his ḥadīth until his Rāfiḍī beliefs became more pronounced. Such as his

---

[27] Shaykh al-Mufīd’s al-Risāla al-Hilāliyya, chapter 7, quoted here http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1703_نهج-السعادة-الشيخ-المحمودي-ج-٧/الصفحة_184

[28] Ṣahīḥ Muslim Introduction 54 https://sunnah.com/muslim/introduction/53

belief in Rajʿa (return to Dunyā before Qiyāma) of Imāmʿ Alī.

His belief in Naṣṣ Imamate of Imāmʿ Alī until reaching al-Ṣādiq, as shown in the two reports above.

And additionally, his style of narration with the proto-Sunnis had changed.

Instead of narrating a direct chain from the Prophet, Jābir started narrating aḥādīth from Imām al-Bāqir, who narrated directly from Rasūl Allāh with no intermediary in between.

This ḥadīth in Ṣahīḥ Muslim clarifies:

"*Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us, Abū Yaḥyā al-Ḥimmānī narrated to us, Qabīṣah and his brother [Sufyān ibnʿUqbah] narrated to us, that they heard al-Jarrāḥ ibn Malīḥ saying, I heard Jābir say:*

'I have 70,000 Ḥadīth all of which are on authority of Abū Jaʿfar [i.e, al-Bāqir], on authority of the Prophet, peace and blessings upon him'."[29]

This style of narration with no intermediary between the Imāmand the Prophet is characteristic of Shīʿī aḥādīth, which is clarified in Jābir's early statement that the knowledge of the Prophet was supernaturally transmitted to later Imāms.

[29]Ṣahīḥ Muslim Introduction 55 https://sunnah.com/muslim/introduction/54

And it can be confirmed in this following Shīʿī ḥadīth in ‘ʿAwālī al-Laʾālī’ where Imām al-Bāqir addresses Jābir ibn Yazīd:

“*Narrated Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Juʿfī:*

Abū Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] said:

There is no person more of a liar against Allāh and his Prophet, more than he who accuses us Ahl al-Bayt of lying or lies against us.

Because we narrate a ḥadīth from Rasūl Allāh or Allāh. So if we lie, then Allāh and his Prophet had lied.”

عن جابر بن يزيد الجعفي قال قال أبو جعفر عليه السلام ما أحد أكذب على الله ولا على رسوله ممن كذبنا أهل البيت أو كذب علينا لأنا انما نحدث عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وعن الله فإذا كذبنا فقد كذب الله ورسوله.[30]

It is evident that Imām al-Bāqir had taught Jābir that whatever ḥadīth he or the Imāms narrate from the Prophet - it is definitively the Prophet’s words. Such that if they lie, then it is as if the Prophet lied, (as their knowledge is supernaturally transmitted from the Prophet).

8. Imām al-Bāqir to al-Ṣādiq (before 310 AH / 923 CE)

[30]Al-ʿAwālīby Ibn Jumhūral-Aḥsāʾī http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1587_جامع-أحاديث-الشيعة-السيد-البروجردي-ج-١٣/الصفحة_588

Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310 AH / 923 CE) was a scholar and historian, who perhaps can be described as the most prominent Islamic historian throughout history.

One of the chief historians al-Ṭabarī cites heavily in his famous historia-*Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* - is the historian Abū Mikhnaf. Al-Ṭabarī cites him with regards to the events of the Battle of Karbalāʾ(it is the earliest surviving recollection of the incident and its preludes - which has a full isnād, as opposed to earlier surviving accounts such that as of Tārīkh Yaʿqūbī which offer no isnād).

Another famous reliance of Abū Mikhnaf by Ṭabarī is when Ṭabarī cites the historical events related to al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī. Ṭabarī's account of al-Ḥajjāj comes almost entirely from Abū Mikhnaf.

Being so, Abū Mikhnaf died in around 157 AH / 774 CE. He was a contemporary of Imām al-Sajjād, al-Bāqir, and al-Ṣādiq.

The following report included by Ṭabarī in his historia highlights Abū Mikhnaf's observation of the Rāfiḍa's belief in Naṣṣ Imamate:

"*They [the Rāfiḍa] claimed that Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī [al-Bāqir] - brother of Zayd ibn ʿAlī - is the Imām. And that he [al-Bāqir] had died one day, and his son Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad was alive so they [Rāfiḍa] said:*

‘Jaʿfar is our Imām today after his father. And he is more worthy of the matter [rulership] after his father, and we do not follow Zayd as he is not an Imām

After that, Zayd labeled them ‘the Rāfiḍa [rejectors]’.

وكانوا يزعمون أن أبا جعفر محمد بن علي أخا زيد بن علي هو الأمام وكان قد هلك يومئذ وكان ابنه جعفر بن محمد حيا فقالوا جعفر إمامنا اليوم بعد أبيه وهو أحق بالامر بعد أبيه ولا نتبع زيد بن علي فليس بإمام[31]

Evaluation

Abū Mikhnaf’s account shows how the Rāfiḍa believed in Naṣṣ Imamate - that one cannot be an Imām except if he designated by divine will, after his father.

Even though Zayd was more revolutionary, this did not appeal to the Rāfiḍa because only divine designation by the Imām’s predecessor can make one an Imām. Hence, they rejected Zayd and Abū Mikhnaf reports that Zayd called them ‘the Rāfiḍa (rejectors) because of this. They believed only a divinely designated Imām is worthy of rulership, personal merit alone does not make one worthy of Imamate and rulership - hence they believed Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad was the Imām in lieu of Zayd.

[31]Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, volume 5, page 498

It is worth mentioning that Abū Mikhnaf is considered unreliable in ḥadīth by the bulk of Sunnī scholars.

Ibn Ḥayyān describes him for example in the following way:

"[*Abū Mikhnaf] is a Rāfiḍī who curses the Ṣaḥāba and he narrates fabricated aḥādīth, [claiming] they are transmitted from reliable narrators*".

رافضي يشتم الصحابة ويروي الموضوعات عن الثقات[32]

However, this weakness in ḥadīth does not necessarily mean one cannot rely upon AbūMikhnaf's historical works.

As a demonstration, the historian Ibn Isḥāq is mainly considered a weak narrator in ḥadīth by Sunnī scholars, to the extent that Mālik ibn Anas described him in the following way:

"*Mālik said: Ibn Isḥāq is merely a [liar] from among the Dajājila [liars], we have kicked him from Medina"*

فقال مالك وما ابن إسحاق إنما هو دجال من الدجاجلة نحن أخرجناه من المدينة[33]

---

[32]Lisān al-Mīzān, volume 4 pag 366

[33]Al-Wāfī bil Wafayāt, by al-Ṣafadī page 123, volume 2.
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3565_الوافي-بالوفيات-الصفدي-ج-٢/الصفحة_129

Yet, Sunnī scholars still highly regard Ibn Isḥāq’s historical works - in particular with regards to the sīra(biography) of Prophet Muḥammad.

Thus, Abū Mikhnaf’s weakness in ḥadīth does not necessarily make his historical work useless.

Regardless, Abū Mikhnaf was a contemporary of Imām al-Sajjād to al-Ṣādiq.

Him being a Rāfiḍī or even a liar does not matter with regards to our research - because at the very least, we can observe that the idea of Naṣṣ Imamate as we know it today existed before 774 CE (157 AH).

9. Imām al-Bāqir to al-Ṣādiq (before 279 AH / 892 CE)

Aḥmad ibn Yaḥya al-Balādhurī (d. 279 AH / 892 CE), a prominent historian who wrote on the history and genealogies of the descendants of the prophet Muḥammad.

He cites the narration of Abū Mikhnaf mentioned by al-Ṭabarī, corroborating the earliness of this narration (given that al-Balādhurī died around 30 years before Ṭabarī’s death). Additionally, al-Balādhurī mentions another narration by Abū Mikhnaf clearly highlighting the concept of Naṣṣ Imamate.

These following are the narrations:

“***They [the Rāfiḍa] say that Abā Jaʿfar - Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn is the Imām. And Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad is our Imām after his father - and he is most worthy of it [i.e, Imamate] than Zayd, even if he were [Imām al-Bāqir’s] brother.”***

وقالوا: إن أبا جعفر محمد بن علي بن الحسين هو الإمام وجعفر بن محمد إمامنا بعد أبيه وهو أحق بها من زيد وإن كان أخاه

“*It is said that Zayd requested from them [i.e, the Rāfiḍa] that they ask Abā Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī (on whether to revolt with Zayd).*

If he [al-Bāqir] ordered them to rise with him (Zayd), they would rise with him.

So they then told him (Zayd): Even if he orders us to rise with you, we wouldn’t rise because we know that is out of taqiyya - out of shyness from you.

So he [Zayd] said what he said (about the Rāfiḍa).”

ويقال أن زيدا طلب منهم أن يسألواء ابا جعفرمحمد بن علي فإن أمرهم بالخروج معه خرجوا فاعتلوا عليه ثم قالوا : لو أمرنا بالخروج معك ما خرجنا لأنا نعلم أن ذلك تقية واستحياء منك فقال ما قال[34]

Evaluation:

[34]Ansāb al-Ashrāf, vol 2, page 379

It becomes evident that the key Imamite concept of Naṣṣ Imamate is highlighted here in that Imām al-Ṣādiq being more worthy to succeed his father al-Bāqir in Imamate.

The Imamate which the Rāfiḍa believed of al-Ṣādiq was beyond fallible human personal characteristics.

The belief regarding al-Ṣādiq’s succession from al-Bāqir is clearly due to divine will.

This is evident in the Rāfiḍa refusing to believe in Zayd’s Imamate - even if al-Ṣādiq orders them to, because they believe the order will be in taqiyya. As only a divinely appointed individual can be Imām, not a mere revolutionary leader.

Why did the Shīʿa - per these historical reports - believed that even if al-Ṣādiq orders them to join Zayd’s rebellion, it will be put of taqiyya?

Aḥādīth such as the following clarify:

“*Al-Ṣādiq said:*

‘O son of al-Nuʿmān, if you lived in an oppressive state then walk and greet whom you do taqiyya from [with acceptance]. The one whom goes against the state is a killer of himself. And Allāh says ‘Do not throw yourselves into destruction’”

الحسن بن علي بن شعبة في تحف العقول : عن محمد بن النعمان قال قال الصادق عليه السلام : " يا بن النعمان ، إذا كانت دولة الظلم فامش واستقبل من

تتقيه بالتحية ، فان المتعرض للدولة قاتل نفسه وموبقها ، أن الله يقول : * (ولا تلقوا " بأيديكم إلى التهلكة)) * ١[35]

This aqīda in prohibition of rising before the Qāʾim can be evident in classical scholars such as Shaykh al-Ṣadūq who says in his work *Al-Iʿtiqādāt*:

"*Taqiyya is obligatory and must not be lifted until the emergence of al-Qāʾim. Whomever leaves it before his rise, he has exited the religion of Allāh and the religion of the Imāmiyya. And he has violated Allāh, and His messengers, and the Imāms.*"

والتقية واجبة لا يجوز رفعها إلى أن يخرج القائم - عليه السلام - ، فمن تركها قبل خروجه فقد خرج عن دين الله ودين الإمامية (٢) وخالف الله ورسوله والأئمة[36]

Being that such a belief is enshrined in the Imāmiyya - whomever leaves taqiyya (to rise) - before the Qāʾim, is not a believer.

There is an interesting ḥadīth from Rijāl al-Kashī - which, if one takes upon it - would highlight how Zayd would have worked around this Imamite ideology on rising being prohibited before the rise of the Qāʾim:

A companion of Imām al-Ṣādiq, Abū al-Ṣabāḥ tells Zayd:

[35]Tuḥaf al-ʿUqūl, page 309
[36] Al-Iʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyya, page 108, Shaykh al-Ṣadūq

“*O Abā al-Ḥusayn [i.e, Zayd ibn ʿAlī] it had been reported to me that you claimed that the Imāms are four: three passed, and the fourth is the Qāʾim [i.e, alluding to Zayd being the Qāʾim].*

He [Zayd] said: This is what I said.”

له:يا أبا الحسين بلغني أنك زعمت أن الأئمة أربعة:ثلاثة مضوا، والرابع هو القائم، قال:هكذا قلت،[37]

Eschatologism, in the form of Mahdism, would be the only way to convince the placated non-revolutionary Shīʿa to revolt. As they would not be convinced by logical grounds - only a direct Naṣṣ from the Imām, not said in taqiyya, would make them revolt.

A comparison can be made with the later Zaydī Imām, Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, would also claim to be the Qāʾim to gain the support of Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad’s followers. The Imām rejected his Mahdihood, but ordered the Shīʿa to rise with him out of taqiyya (as will be clarified in the next section).

Anyway, I digress.

Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad’s followers not rising with Zayd made him, according to Ismāʿīlī philosopher Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 322 AH / 935 CE), made Zayd reject the

[37]Rijāl al-Kashī, quoted in Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth volume 1, page 288

followers of Jaʿfar - Zayd's followers calling them the 'Rāfiḍa' - and create his own splinter group away from.

Seemingly, the report suggests that Zayd's splinter group was carved from followers he recruited from Jaʿfar's followers - whom were united before Zayd's rebellion. But it seems, Zayd's daʿwah did not change the ideology of most of Jaʿfar's followers.

Al-Rāzī says in his *Kitāb al-Zīna*:

"A faction among the Shīʿa were united under one matter before Zayd's appearance.

However, a group of them leaned towards Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad and believed in his Imamate. So Zayd's companions called them the 'Rāfiḍa' because they rejected Zayd."

إن طائفة من الشيعة كانت مجتمعة على أمر واحد قبل ظهور زيد، فانحازت طائفة إلى جعفر بن محمد وقالوا بإمامته فسماهم أصحاب زيد الرافضة لرفضهم زيدا **38**

The ideology of the followers of Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad bound them to their Imām, believing he could only be designated by divine will (Naṣṣ). And their immense

---

[38] Kitābal-Zīna, page 215

loyalty to him is based on this factor - any personal factor such as knowledge, strength, revolutionary character - would be secondary.

Only Naṣṣ chooses an Imām.

10. Imām al-Ṣādiq to al-Kāẓim (before 321 AH / 933 CE)

Abū al-Ḥusaynʿ Abd Al-Raḥīm al-Khayyāṭ (d. 321 AH / 933 CE) was the Shaykh of the Muʿtazila of Baghdad in his lifetime.

Being so, he would commonly engage with opposing schools of thoughts and denominations in the Abbasid capital. His prominent rebuttal was to the Shīʿī mutakallim (debater using ʿIlm al-Kalām) known as Ibn al-Rāwand īwho had adopted the views of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam - companion of Imām al-Ṣādiq - regarding Naṣṣ Imamate.

Al-Khayyāṭ's response to Ibn al-Rāwandī can be seen in his book *al-Intiṣār*, in which we can get an idea of the position of Imamate Ibn al-Rāwandī was arguing for and possibly the view of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam himself.

The following snippets from the book are relevant to our research:

Imām's purpose is to preserve Islam from corruption

1. “*What is amazing is that the Rāfiḍa argue that there must be an infallible Imām, entrusted with the ẓāhir and bāṭin, to protect them (as they claim) from change in religion, loss of the Sunnan [of the Prophet], and protect their religion*”

ومن العجائب ان الرافضة تحتج في ان لا بد منإمام معصوم مأمون الظاهر والباطن ليأمنوا بزعمهم من تغيير الدين وتضييع السنن وأن يحفظ عليهم دينهم[39]

2. “*What the Qaṭʿiyyanarrate from Jaʿfar and Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, you see the [preposterously] amazing*”

والى ما ترويه القطعية عن جعفر وموسى بن جعفر فإنك ترى اعاجيب لا تخفي عن الناظر[40]

Evaluation:

The Qaṭʿiyya are the Rāfiḍa who believed Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar did in fact die - as opposed to the Wāqifa who believed Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar died. Thus, they believed ʿAlī al-Riḍā succeeded Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar.

It is evident that Al-Khayyāṭ is alluding to the fact that the Qaṭʿiyya (proto-IthnāʿAshariyya) believed in a Naṣṣ Imamate from Jaʿfar going to Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar.

---

[39]Kitāb al-Intiṣār, page 136
[40]*Ibid* Kitāb al-Intiṣār, page 136

And that succession of Imamate carried supernatural capabilities which the Qaṭʿiyya reported - hence the 'preposterously amazing' aḥādīth he mentions regarding the Imāms.

The Imām of the Qaṭʿiyya appointed by Naṣṣ was seen by them as having the following features:

1. Infallibility

2. Entrusted with the ẓāhir and bāṭin. Suggesting mainstream Imāmiyya was not focus chiefly on the bāṭin, as the Ismāʿīliyya ghulāt sects such as the Khaṭṭābiyya. Rather, mainstream Imamism believed the Imām taught religion in both its ẓāhir and bāṭin forms.

3. Protect religion and the sunnah of the Prophet from loss

Given that Ibn al-Rāwandī had adopted and was defending the views of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 795 CE) regarding Naṣṣ Imamate - we can see it as quite likely to assume that the above features was how mainstream Imāmiyya viewed the Imāms during Imām al-Ṣādiq's lifetime (also the peak of Hishām's intellectual debates and preaching of Imamism).

11. Imām al-Kāẓim (before 356 AH / 967 CE)

Abū al-Farajal-Iṣfahānī was a very prominent Zaydī historian and poet. His works, Kitābal-Aghānī and Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn, are highly regarded by Zaydī scholars. In addition, the pre-eminent Twelver classical scholar Shaykh al-Mufīd cited al-Iṣfahānī's works very frequently in his book *Kitāb al-Irshād*- which acts as a historical work for the Imāmiyya as well.

Regardless, al-Iṣfahānī's works do exhibit some very Zaydī bias in a number of narrations he cites.

With this in mind, a number of aḥādīth cited by al-Iṣfahānī confirm crucial aspects about the Twelver Imāms (as will be shown in the next section).

Below is one snippet of aḥādīth of this nature regarding Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim:

Abū al-Faraj states that a "man from our companions" (i.e, a Zaydī man) had told him (Abū al-Faraj) - narrating from some descendants of Abū Ṭālib:

"[*When Mūsā died], it was called upon: 'This is Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar whom the Rāfiḍa claims that he does not die. So look at him, and they (the onlookers) looked*."

وحدثني رجل من أصحابنا عن بعض الطالبيين :انه نودي عليه :هذا موسى بن جعفر الذي تزعم الرافضة انه لا يموت ، فانظروا إليه فنظروا **41**

[41]Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn, page 336 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1277_مقاتل-الطالبيين-أبو-الفرج-الأصفهانى/الصفحة_352

Evaluation:

It is evident the Rāfiḍa saw Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar as a supernatural figure who did not die, per his position as Imām and also Qāʾim (i.e, being the Mahdī). This is directly related to his position as Imām and the supernatural traits he inherited by this virtue from his forefathers.

The above report is interesting, because it is a Zaydī narrator confirming the general crux of the message Twelver sources claim the loyalists of the Abbasid caliph proclaimed to the public after the death of Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar - while showcasing his body, as evident in Shaykh al-Ṣadūq'sʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā:

"*Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar died in the hands of al-Sindī ibn Shāhak, so he was carried on a casket and it was proclaimed: 'This is the Imām of the Rāfiḍa, so know him [i.e, look at him to confirm he died'.*

Then when they came to the location of the shurṭa(Abbasid secret police), four men proclaimed:

'Indeed, whomever wants to see the wretched son of the wretched - he should come out!'

توفيموسى بن جعفر عليهما السلام في يد السندي بن شاهك فحمل على نعش ونودي عليه : هذا أمام الرافضة فاعرفوه فلما أتى به مجلس الشرطة (1) أقام أربعة نفر فنادوا : إلا من أراد أن يرى الخبيث بن الخبيث فليخرج[42]

Furthermore, the truly intriguing part about the Zaydī report is that it confirms something quite controversial about the death of Mūsā al-Kāẓim.

The claim of the Wāqifa (believers that al-Kāẓim did not die and went to ghayba) reflected upon a belief that existed before al-Kāẓim's death!

Whereas Imamite sources indicate that the leaders of the Wāqifa fabricated aḥādīth regarding al-Kāẓim's ghayba after his death, for financial profit (being that they were his deputies) - as can be seen below in al-Ṭabarasī's statement in his work *Aʿlām al-Warā*

"*The companions of Abī al-Ḥasan Mūsā were in consensus that he [Mūsā] gave his Naṣṣ [to al-Riḍā], except those who deviated from them from the Wāqifa - known as 'al-Mamṭūra'.*

And the apparent reason for this is their lust from the money that was brought to them during the lifetime of Abī al-Ḥasan [al-Kāẓim] and what they controlled from it.

[42] ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā, vol 2, page 93 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1143_عيون-أخبار-الرضا-ع-الشيخ-الصدوق-ج-٢/الصفحة_92

So this made them deny his death, and his successor in Imamate and deny the Naṣṣ was given to him."

وأشار عليه نص أنه على السلام عليه موسى الحسن أبي أبيه اصحاب أجمع في ظاهر والسبب ، الممطورة المسمين الواقفة من عنهم شذ من ألا ، إليه بالإمامة عليه الحسن أبي مدة في إليهم المجباة الاموال من أيديهم في كان فيما طمعهم ذلك ، حياته وأعاء وفاته إنكار على ذلك فحملهم ، ودائعه من عندهم كان وما السلام ليذهبوا ، عليه النص وإنكار ، الإمامة عن بعده خليفته ودفع

بما في أيديهم مما وجب عليهم أن يسلموه إ **43**

While it is true that the overwhelming majority of the companions of al-Kāẓim eventually recognized al-Riḍā, this was not the case in the beginning.

Shaykh al-Ṭūsī's *Ikhtiyār Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*[44] lists 60 out of 300 companions as having been Wāqifa.

Such a large amount of companions, including the top most fuqahāʾ of the Imāmiyya such as ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā al-Amri[45] and Imām al-Kāẓim's son Ibrāhīm.

Most of the Wāqifa were convinced on ideological premise - not out of lust for money.

[43] A'lam al-Wara, vol 2, page 42 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3696_إعلام-الورى-بأعلام-الهدى-الشيخ-الطبرسي-ج-٢/الصفحة_41

[44]https://www.kitabat.info/subject.php?id=128062

[45] Al-ʿIddafī al-Uṣūlby al-Ṭūsī, vol 1, page 150 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/2748_عدة-الأصول-ج-١/الصفحة_0?pageno=150

Ibrāhīm son of Imām al-Kāẓim’s example as highlighted in ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā:

“I asked Ibrāhīm son of Abī al-Ḥasan Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar:

‘What do you say regarding your father [al-Kāẓim]?’

He [Ibrāhīm] said: He is alive.

What do you say regarding your brother Abī al-Ḥasan [al-Riḍā]?

He [Ibrāhīm] said: He is a truthful thiqa (trustworthy person)

عن : الهمداني ، عن علي ، عن أبيه ، عن بكر بن صالح ، قال : قلت لابراهيم بن أبي الحسن موسى بن جعفر عليه السلام : ما قولك في أبيك قال : هو حي قلت : فما قولك في أخيك أبي الحسن عليه السلام ؟ قال : ثقة صدوق[46]

Ḥadīth in al-Kāfī:

“I asked al-al-Riḍā:

A man went to your brother, and he [Ibrāhīm] told him that your father [O al-Riḍā] is alive (i.e, al-Kāẓim is alive and is not dead). And that you know of that what he knows.

---

[46] ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā, vol 1, page 39

He [al-Riḍā] said: Subḥān Allāh! The Messenger of Allāh dies and Mūsā [al-Kāẓim] does not die. He passed away just like Rasūl Allāh passed away.”

* (11)باب ما جاء في موسى بن جعفر عليهما السلام) * 210 - الكليني - رحمه الله - عن الحسين بن محمد ، عن معلى بن محمد ، عن علي بن أسباط قال : قلت للرضا عليه السلام : إن رجلا عنى أخاك إبراهيم ، فذكر له أن أباك في الحياة ، وانك تعلم من ذلك ما يعلم ، فقال : سبحان الله يموت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم ولا يموت موسيعليه السلام ، قد والله مضى كما مضى رسول الله**[47]**

12. Imām al-Riḍā to al-Hādī(before 246 AH / 860 CE)

Al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Rassī was a Zaydī Imām, as mentioned in point #4, was a contemporary of Imāmʿ Alī al-Hādī and wrote a rebuttal to the Rāfiḍa.

As part of his rebuttals to the Rāfiḍa, he points out their claim of Naṣṣ succession from ʿAlī ibn Mūsā to his son Muḥammad and from his son Muḥammad to ʿAlī al-Hādī. He also criticizes the idea of a child becoming an Imām, as shown in the passage before in the author’s work *al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa.*

“*If the Rawāfiḍ claim that al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan was a child when al-Ḥusayn (ibn ʿAlī) was mature. And the Imām of Muslims can only be a mature (adult).*

[47] Al-Kāfī, as recorded in Bihar al-Anwar, vol 49, page 232 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1480_بحار-الأنوار-العلامة-المجلسي-ج-٤٩/الصفحة_234

It should be said to them: ‘Tell us about your sahib (i.e, your Imām) ʿAlī ibn Mūsā. When he died. Did he not have a son of 3 or 4 years (i.e, Muḥammadal-Jawād)?

When his (ʿAlī ibn Mūsā’s) son Muḥammad died - wasn’t his son young (i.e, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Hādī)?

You have positioned children as Imāms when it is not possible for a child to be an Imām for Muslims?!”

فإن زعمت الروافض ان الحسن بن الحسن كان صبيا ، وحسين بالغ ، ولا يكون اماما للمسلمين الا بالغا ، فصدقتم . يقال لهم اخبرونا عن صاحبكم علي بن موسى حين مات كان ابنه اربع سنين او ثلاث ؟ وابنه محمد حين مات كان ابنه صغيرا ؟ فلم نصبتم الاطفال اذا لم يجز للاطفال أن يكونوا أئمة للمسلمين؟[48]

Evaluation:

It is evident from al-Rassī’s words that the Imāmiyya took Imāms from al-Riḍā to al-Hādī as Imāms, despite al-Riḍā’s successors being children. Yet, this did not stop a consensus of the Imāmiyya on those figures being Imāms.

This is because they were given the divine will (Naṣṣ) - thus secondary features such as physical age would not matter.

[48]Majmūʿ Rasāʾil al-Qāsim al-Rassī, al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa, page 548

It shows that any dispute by the Shīʿa regarding taking these figures as Imāms did not cause major dissent or splits. As al-Rassī addresses generalizes the ‘Rāfiḍa’, saying they took these children as Imāms. This shows that the bulk of the Rāfiḍa believed in these figures as Imāms, thus any group which splits from them would be out of the norm.

On another hand, the later Imāms being very young may have been to prepare the Shīʿa for the Twelfth Imām who would also be around 5 years old when he received the Naṣṣ from his father.

13. Imām al-Hādī (before 284 AH / 897 CE)

Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad al-Yaʿqūbī (d. 284 AH / 897 CE) was a prominent Abbasid historian and geographer.

He is most famous for authoring the work the book of history otherwise known as “*Tārīkh al-Yaʿqūbī*”.

Al-Yaʿqūbī does not follow an isnad-based methodology in his historia, which is out of the norm with regards to most Muslim historians.

Yet however - the fact al-Yaʿqūbī is an author from the 9th century CE would mean that the text I will cite from his book is also from the 800s CE.

The snippet is as below:

“Al-Mutawakkil wrote to ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Riḍā ibn Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad - to come to [Samarra] from Medina.

And ʿAbdullāh ibn Muḥammadal-Hāshimī had written [to al-Mutawakkil ***informing him that a people are saying that he [i.e, al-Hādī] is the Imām.***

So he [al-Hādī] left Medina, accompanied by Yaḥya ibn Harthama until he reached Baghdad.

So he we was at a place called Al-Yāsseriya where he stopped, and Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm came to greet him.

***So he saw the people’s eagerness to see him [i.e, al-Hādī] and gathering to see him..*”**

وكتب المتوكل إلى علي بن محمد بن علي الرضى بن موسى بن جعفر بن محمد في الشخوص من المدينة ، وكان عبد الله بن محمد بن داود الهاشمي قد كتب يذكر أن قوما يقولون إنه الأمام ، فشخص عن المدينة ، وشخص يحيى ابن هرثمة معه حتى صار إلى بغداد . فلما كان بموضع يقال له الياسرية نزل هناك ، وركب إسحاق بن إبراهيم لتلقيه ، فرأى تشوق الناس إليه واجتماعهم لرؤيته ، فأقام إلى الليل ، ودخل به في الليل ، فأقام ببغداد بعض تلك الليلة ، ثم نفذ إلى سر من رأى[49]

Evaluation:

The above report is intriguing, in the sense that it confirms that Imām ʿAlī al-Hādī was not simply

[49]Tārīkh al-Yaʿqūbī, vol 2, page 484
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3469_تاريخ-اليعقوبي-اليعقوبي-ج-٢/الصفحة_483

imprisoned because of the intense popularity surrounding him.

But because of the fact there were people claiming he is the Imām! As the caliph’s governor in Medina stated in his letter to the caliph.

Given al-Hādī was not a revolutionary figure nor political figure - and his Imamate would not be simple religious scholarship, otherwise, why would the caliph be threatened by people calling him the Imām?
Al-Hādī’s Imamate would thus only be related to leadership of the ummah by virtue of divine will (Naṣṣ) and supernatural capabilities. Challenging al-Mutawakkil’s credentials as caliph from the descent of al-ʿAbbās ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, as al-Hādī’s lineage would be more superior due to being from the descent of divinely appointed, supernatural figures.

As a tidbit, it is quite intriguing that al-Hādī was very much loved in Iraq when he first came there, showing that the Imām’s networks and agents in Iraq were crucial to spreading his message even outside the borders of Medina.

14. Imām al-Kāẓim to al-Mahdī (before 326 AH / 938 CE)

Abū ZaydʿĪsā ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī(d. 326 AH / 938 CE) was a descendant of Zayd ibn ʿAlī al-Shahīd(founder of Zaydism). Abū Zayd was a very prominent Zaydī

theologian and expert in the genealogy of the descendants of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.[50]

Abū Zayd wrote a polemical book in response to sects in Islam he considered deviant, known as *Kitāb al-Ishhād*. This is an excerpt from the book:

"*And among them [i.e, the Rāfiḍa] is a group which confirmed upon Mūsā's death and chose his son ʿAlī ibn Mūsā to be the Imām after him - to the exclusion of the rest of the sons of Mūsā.*

And they claimed he deserved it through inheritance and will.

Then in his [ʿAlī ibn Mūsā's] progeny until it reached al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī [al-ʿAskarī] - and they claimed he has a son and named him 'al-Khalaf al-Ṣāliḥ' (the righteous progeny).

[al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī had a brother who was seen by the Rāfiḍa as future Imām] who died before his father, then they (Rāfiḍa) returned to his brother al-Ḥasan. As the delusions in [their belief] in his brother Muḥammad became invalidated.

And they said: 'Allāh did badāʾfrom Muḥammad to al-Ḥasan, as he did with Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar to Mūsā. And Ismāʿīl had died in the lifetime of Jaʿfar.

[50]Al-Mujd īfī Ansab al-Ashrāf by ʿAlī ibn Muḥammadal-ʿAlawī, page 178 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3445_المجدي-في-أنساب-الطالبين-علي-بن-محمد-العلوي/الصفحة_336

Until al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī [al-ʿAskarī] died in 263 AH, so some of his companions believed in the Imamate of Jaʿfar ibn ʿAlī. Others believed after the death of Muḥammad (ibn ʿAlī), in al-Ḥasan.

Others claimed that Jaʿfar ibn ʿAlī deserved the Imamate from his father ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad by inheritance and will - to the exclusion of his brother al-Ḥasan. Then they positioned (the Imamate) in the progeny of Jaʿfar by inheritance and will..."

ومنهم فرقة قطعت عليموسيوائتموا بعده بابنه علي ابن موسى عليهما السلام دون سائر ولد موسى عليه السلام وزعموا أنه استحقها بالوراثة والوصية ، ثم في ولده حتى انتهوا إلى الحسن بن علي عليهما السلام فادعوا له ولدا وسموه الخلف الصالح فمات قبل أبيه (3) ، ثم إنهم رجعوا إلى أخيه الحسن وبطل في محمد ما كانوا توهموا - وقالوا : بدا الله من محمد إلى الحسن كما بدا له من إسماعيل بن جعفر إلى موسي و قد مات إسماعيل في حياة جعفر - إلى أن مات الحسن بن علي في سنة ثلاث وستين ومأتين فرجع بعض أصحابه إلى إمامة جعفر بن علي ، كما رجع أصحاب محمد بن علي بعد وفاة محمد إلى الحسن ، وزعم بعضهم أن جعفر بن علي استحق الإمامة من أبيه علي بن محمد بالوراثة والوصية دون أخيه الحسن ، ثم نقلوها في ولد جعفر بالوراثة والوصية[51]

Evaluation:

(1) The author died during al-Ghayba al- Ṣughrā, so he is acting upon information available to him during that era.

[51]Kitāb al-Ishhād, page 9

(2) It shows that the idea of a Twelfth Imām had been firm among the Qaṭʿiyya during the time of al-Ghayba al-Ṣughrā. The Twelfth Imām would come from the lineage of ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā, through (divine) "inheritance and will". This is the concept of Naṣṣ.

(3) It reflects on how the Qaṭʿiyya (proto-Ithnāʿ Ashariyya) kept the name of the 12th Imām secret.

They called him "al-Khalaf al-Ṣāliḥ", instead of "Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan".

(4) It calls into question the extent of how much ḥayra (confusion) period after Imām al-Mahdī's.

Occultation was centered on the idea of Twelve Imāms, and who the Twelve Imām was, because it appears such doubts were quelled rather quickly and did not create major dissenting beliefs.

As evident by the majority of Qaṭʿiyya believing the Khalaf al-Ṣāliḥ was the Twelfth Imām.

15. Imām al-Mahdī (before 369 AH / 979 CE)

After Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī died, the events in his historia*Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* regarding year 302 AH (914-915 CE) were incomplete.

Thus, comes the role of ʿUrayb ibn Saʿd al-Qurṭubī, an Andalusian historian who was made by the Umayyad Andalusians governor for the area of Kora Ashona, and

the official scribe for Umayyad caliph of Cordoba - al-Ḥakam II.[52]

Al-Qurṭubī aimed to "complete" the history of al-Ṭabarī onto the next decades that came, and thus authored *Ṣilat Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī.*

In Ṣilat Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, the following incident is mentioned regarding Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī:

The caliph sent Ibn Ṭūmār, the naqīb (genealogy checker) of Banī Hāshim to the house of a man claiming descent from ʿAlī.

In the man's house, one of those present stood up.

Ibn Ṭūmār asked him about his genealogy.

The man claimed he was "*Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn [ibn Muḥammad] ibn ʿAlī ibn Mūsā ibn Jaʿfaral-Riḍā"*.

And that he came from the desert.

So Ibn Ṭūmār told him:

'*Al-Ḥasan [al-ʿAskarī] did not produce progeny*'.

And it was disputed among people whether al-Ḥasan produced progeny. Some people said he produced an heir, another people said he did not.

[52]Kitāb al-Aʿlām by al-Ziriklī, page 227 https://al-maktaba.org/book/12286/3653

So people were confused in their matter, as to whether this man was truly the son of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī.

The naqīb, with his expertise in ʿAlawī genealogy verification, enquired about the man.

It turns out he was a man known by the name of “Ibn al-Ḍabʿī” from Aleppo, whose father was a companion of the Shīʿī vizier Ibn al-Furāt and served in his judiciary administration.

وأمر المقتدر أن يحضر ابن طومار نقيب الطالبيين ومشايخ آل أبي طالب فيسمعون منه ويفهمون أمره فدخلوا عليه وهو على برذعة طبرية مرتفعة فما قام إلى واحد منهم فسأله ابن طومار عن نسبته فزعم أنه محمد بن الحسن بن علي بن موسى بن جعفر الرضا وأنه قدم من البادية فقال له ابن طومار لم يعقب الحسن وكان قوم يقولون إنه أعقب وقوم قالوا لم يعقب فبقي الناس في حيرة من أمره حتى قال ابن طومار هذا يزعم أنه قدم من البادية وسيفه جديد الحلية والصنعة فابعثوا بالسيف إلى دار الطاق وسلوا عن صانعه وعن نصله فبعث به إلى أصحاب السيوف بباب الطاق فعرفوه وأحضروا رجلا ابتاعه من صيقل هناك فقيل له لمن ابتعت هذا السيف فقال لرجل يعرف بابن الضبعي كان أبوه من أصحاب ابن الفرات وتقلد له المظالم بحلب فأحضر الضبعي الشيخ وجمع بينه وبين هذا المدعى إلى بني أبي طالب فأقر بأنه ابنه فاضطرب الدعي وتلجج في قوله فبكى الشيخ بين يدي الوزير حتي رحمه ووعده بأن يستوهب عقوبته ويحبسه أو ينفيه فضج بنو هاشم وقالوا يجب أن يشهر هذا بين الناس ويعاقب أشد عقوبة ثم حبس الدعي وحمل بعد ذلك على جمل وشهر في الجانبين يوم التروية ويوم عرفة ثم حبس في حبس المصريين بالجانب الغربي[53]

Evaluation:

Ibn al-Furāt was a loyalist of the sufarāʾ of Imām al-Mahdī, and thus essential protect their cause. Perhaps

[53]Ṣilat Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, page 35 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/3482_صلة-تاريخ-الطبري-القرطبي/الصفحة_35

this was an attempt to protect Imām al-Mahdī, by making the Abbasids think he is dead?

Anyway, I digress. Several other crucial conceptions are confirmed by this passage.

1) The fact people disputed about whether al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī produced an heir (some agreeing, some disagreeing) shows that this was a significant event.

   If al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī were a common, normal man - then there would be no reason for the idea of whether or not he produced an heir to be a pressing matter 40 years after his death.

   Thus - confirming (from a contemporary, non-Shīʿī source) that religious assumptions were attached to the idea of al-ʿAskarī having a son.An idea most likely of Naṣṣ Imamate with regards to al-Mahdī's descent from al-ʿAskarī.

2) What confirms this is that the naqīb immediately stated 'al-Ḥasan did not produce progeny'. If he were a common man, then the naqīb would simply enquire about al-Ḥasan's progeny. It wouldn't be a ready assumption.

3) Ibn al-Ḍabʿī having a father who served under the Shīʿī vizier Ibn al-Furāt, who gave protection and backing to the sufarāʾ(deputies) of Imām Mahdī. Gives further credibility the idea of a Shīʿī conception

of the Mahdī being common knowledge in Baghdad at the time.

4) The idea of Imām Mahdī living in the desert seems to have been known before al-Ghayba al-Kubrā.

16. All Twelve Imāms (before 324 AH / 936 CE)

Abū al-Ḥasanal-Ashʿarī (d. 324 AH / 936 CE) was a very prominent Muslim theologian of the 800s and 900s CE. Previously Muʿtazilī, he became mainstream Sunnī and established his own strain of thought within Sunnism - the Ashʿariyya (still present today).

Among al-Ashʿarī's works is a heresiography focusing on all the Islamic sects that appeared throughout history, known as '*Maqālāt al-Islamiyyīn wa Ikhtilāf al-Muṣallīn'.*

The following is an excerpt from al-Maqālāt on the Rāfiḍa during al-Ghayba al-Ṣughrā:

"*The first group among them [the Rāfiḍa], and they are the Qaṭʿiyya.*

They were named Qaṭʿiyya because they confirmed (qaṭaʿū) the death of Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, and they are the generality of the Shīʿa.

They claim the prophet gave Naṣṣ upon the Imamate of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib - by explicitly naming him and indicating his person (to be the successor).

And that ʿAlī gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son al-Ḥasan. And al-Ḥasan gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his brother al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī. And al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn. And ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī. And Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad. And Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar. And Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son ʿAlī ibn Mūsā. And ʿAlī ibn Mūsā gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī. And Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad. And ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī - and he was the one in Samarra. And al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī gave Naṣṣ on the Imamate of his son Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī - and he the Awaited Hidden [one] for them whom they claim will fill the Earth will justice after it had been filled with injustice and oppression.”

فالفرقة الأولى منهم وهم القطعية وإنما سموا قطعية لأنهم قطعوا على موت موسى بن جعفر بن محمد بن علي وهم جمهور الشيعة يزعمون أن النبي نص على إمامة علي بن أبي طالب واستخلفه بعده بعينه واسمه وأن عليا نص على إمامة ابنه الحسن بن علي وأن الحسن بن علي نص على إمامة أخيه الحسين بن علي وأن الحسين بن علي نص على إمامة ابنه علي بن الحسين وأن علي بن

الحسين نص على إمامة ابنه محمد بن علي وأن محمد بن علي نص على إمامة ابنه جعفر بن محمد وأن جعفر بن محمد نص على إمامة ابنه موسى بن جعفر وأن موسى بن جعفر نص على إمامة ابنه علي بن موسى وأن علي بن موسي نص على إمامة ابنه محمد بن علي بن موسى وأن محمد بن علي نص على إمامة ابنه علي بن محمد بن علي بن موسى وأن علي بن محمد بن علي بن موسى نص على إمامة ابنه الحسن بن علي بن محمد بن علي بن موسى وهو الذي كان بسامرا وأن الحسن بن علي نص على إمامة ابنه محمد بن الحسن بن علي وهو الغائب المنتظر عندهم الذي يدعون أنه يظهر فيملأ الأرض عدلا بعد أن ملئت ظلما وجورا. [54]

17. All Twelve Imāms - Inscription (363 AH / 974 CE)

An inscription commissioned by the Shīʿī Buyid ruler of Iran, ʿAdud al-Dawla, in 974 CE (363 AH) mentions the names of the Twelve Imāms.

The following passage clarifies:

“Yet some clear historical indications prove that at least several Buyid rulers were Twelver Shiites.

A vivid example hereof is an inscription from 363 AH written on behalf of a Buyid sovereign, emphasizing the position of the Twelve Imāms, mentioning them one by one.”[55]

---

[54]Maqālāt al-Islamiyyīn wa Ikhtilāf al-Muṣallīn, page 89
[55] The SAGE Handbook of Islamic Studies, page 298 https://books.google.nl/books?id=4cN-fDiQl40C

The exact details of the inscription - pertaining to the Twelve Imāms - may be seen below: [56]

363/973-74, five wooden plaques, now dispersed but probably from a grille in a tomb at Kufa

Description: (A-B) rectangular plaques (81 x 38 cm.), each with frame band and keel arch encompassing 15 lines of simple Kufic; (C) rectangular plaque (53 x 30 cm.) with a keel arch encompassing 13 lines of simple Kufic and a larger line of foliated Kufic in the spandrels; (D-E) rectangular plaques (46 x 23 cm.), each with two lines of simple Kufic across the top and a line of simple Kufic in the keel arch below
Provenance: (A-B) ex-Rabenou collection; (C-D) Cairo Museum 9738 and 9774; (E) ex-Acheroff collection
Type of inscription: Pious, foundation
Publication: Wiet, *L'Exposition persane de 1931*, no. 6; *RCEA* 1831-32
Illustration: Wiet, pls. XI and XII (left); *Survey of Persian Art*, p. 1460; Kühnel, "Kunst Persiens unter den Buyiden," *ZDMG* 106 (1956), pl. 28; figs. 16-18
Text:
(A-B): (1) Frame bands:

بسمله اللهم صل على محمد وآله وبلغ بايمانى اكمل
الايمان واجعل يمينى افضل اليمين وأنبه بنيتى
الى احسن النيات ويعملى الى احسن الاعمال اللهم
وفر بلطفك نيتى وصحح بما عندك يمينى
واستصلح بقدرتك ما فسد منى اللهم صل على
محمد واله واكفنى ما يشغلنى الاهتمام به
واستعملنى لما تسئلنى غدا عنه واستفرغ ايامى
فيما خلقتنى له واغننى ...ع على فى رزقك ولا
تفتنى بالنظر واعزنى ولا تبتلننى بالكبر وعبدنى
ولا تفسد عبادتى بالعجب واجر للناس على يدى
الخير

(3) Two lines inside the arches of (2):

لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له

(4) Pointed arches, repeated on each panel:

بسمله اللهم صل وسلم وزد وبارك على النبى وعلى
على وفاطمة والحسن والحسين وعلى بن الحسين
ومحمد بن على وجعفر بن محمد وموسى بن جعفر
وعلى بن موسى ومحمد بن على وعلى بن محمد
والحسن بن على والحجة

(5) Top two lines forming triangles inside both pointed arches:

لله الامر من قبل ومن بعد
لله الحكم تعالى شانه

(6) Thirteen lines below (5):

سبحان من لبس العز / والوقار سبحان / من
تعطف بالمجد / وتكرم به سبحان / من لا ينبغى
التسبيح / الا له سبحان من / احصى كل شيء
علمه / سبحان ذى المن و / النعم سبحان ذى
/ القدرة والكرم وا / لفضل سبحان ذى ا /
لقوة والطول والا / من اللهم انى استند
بمعاقد العز من عرشك / ومنتهى الرحمة من / كتابك

"Bismillāh

Oh Allāh send your peace and blessings on the prophet, and on ʿAlī, Fāṭima, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, ʿAlī ibn Mūsā, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad, al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī, and al-Ḥujja [the Mahdī]".

[56] The Monumental Inscriptions from Early Islamic Iran and Transoxiana, page 41 https://books.google.com/books?id=4U0fCVfM8q8C&pg=PA41

بسمله اللهم صل وسلم وزد وبارك على النبي وصل على علي وفاطمة والحسن والحسين علي بن الحسين و محمد بن علي وجعفر بن محمد وموسى بن جعفر وعلي بن موسي ومحمد بن علي وعلي بن محمد والحسن بن علي والحجة

Evaluations, points (16) and (17):

It is thus evident both in literary (points 14 and 16) and archaeological evidence (point 17) that the idea of Twelve Imāms and the Twelfth Imām was very much firm during al-Ghaybaal-Ṣughrāand also the latter part of the 900s CE.

Attribution of Sources

1. Al-Rad ʿalā al-Rāfiḍa by al-Qāsim al-Rassī as part of a collection of letters by al-Rassī.

There are 10 Zaydī chains of the collection, from Zaydī Imāms and *shuyūkh al-ijāza*

أولا: الأسـانيد

كتب ورسائل الإمام القاسم بن إبراهيم من أشهر الكتب في أوساط الزيدية، سواء زيدية العراق أو زيدية الجيل والديلم، أو زيدية اليمن، فهي ليست بحاجة إلى توثيق، ومع هذا فأنا أرويها بعشر طرق عن مشائخي بطريق الإجازة.

الأولى: عن السيد العلامة مفتي الجمهورية أحمد بن محمد زبارة، عن العلامة علي بن أحمد السدمي (١٢٧١ ـ ١٣٦٤هـ)، عن العلامة عبد الكريم عبد الله أبو طالب (١٢٢٤ ـ ١٣٠٩هـ)، عن العلامة إسماعيل بن أحمد الكبسي (١١٥٠ ـ ١٢٣٣هـ)، عن القاضي محمد بن أحمد مشحم المتوفى سنة (١١٨١هـ)، عن السيد صارم الدين إبراهيم بن القاسم بن محمد بن القاسم المتوفى سنة (١١٥١هـ)، عن القاضي أحمد بن سعد الدين المسوري (١٠٠٧ ـ ١٠٧٩هـ)، عن الإمام القاسم بن محمد.

ويروي الإمام القاسم بن محمد، عن أمير الدين بن عبد الله بن نهشل، عن أحمد بن عبد الله الوزير، عن الإمام المتوكل على الله يحيى شرف الدين، عن الإمام محمد بن علي السراجي، عن الإمام عز الدين بن الحسن، عن الإمام المطهر بن محمد الحمزي، عن الإمام أحمد بن يحيى المرتضى، عن أخيه السيد الهادي بن يحيى، عن القاسم بن أحمد بن حميد الشهيد، عن أبيه؛ عن جده الشهيد حميد بن أحمد المحلي، عن الإمام عبد الله بن حمزة، عن العلامة الحسن بن محمد الرصاص، عن القاضي جعفر بن أحمد بن عبد السلام، عن أحمد بن الحسن الكني.

ويروي الإمام المتوكل على الله شرف الدين عن السيد العلامة صارم الدين إبراهيم بن محمد الوزير، عن العلامة عبد لله بن يحيى أبي العطايا، عن أبيه يحيى بن

المهدي، عن العلامة المطهر بن محمد بن المطهر بن يحيى، عن أبيه، عن جده، عن محمد بن أحمد بن أبي الرجال، عن الإمام أحمد بن الحسين، عن الشيخ العالم أحمد بن محمد الأكوع المعروف بشعلة، عن الشيخ محي الدين بن محمد بن أحمد القرشي، عن القاضي جعفر بن أحمد، عن الإمام أحمد بن سليمان؛ عن الشيخ إسحاق بن أحمد، عن عبد الرزاق بن أحمد، عن الشريف علي بن الحارث، وأبي الهيثم يوسف بن أبي العشيرة، عن الحسن بن أحمد الضهري إمام مسجد الهادي، عن محمد بن أبي الفتوح، عن الإمام المرتضى محمد بن يحيى، عن أبيه الإمام الهادي يحيى بن الحسين، عن أبيه الحسين بن القاسم، عن الإمام القاسم بن إبراهيم الرسي.

ويروي أيضا القاضي جعفر بن أحمد، عن القاضي أحمد بن أبي الحسن الكني، عن أبي الفوارس توران شاه، عن أبي علي بن آموج، عن القاضي زيد محمد، عن علي [illegible]

العمري، عن محمد بن محمد الضفري، عن محمد بن علي الشوكاني، عن عبد الـ

أحمد بن عبد القادر، عن أحمد بن عبد الرحمن الشامي، عن حسين بن أحمد زبا
أحمد بن صالح بن أبي الرجال، عن المؤيد بالله محمد بن القاسم، عن الإمام القاسم بن محمد به.

الثالثة: عن السيد العلامة مجد الدين بن محمد المؤيدي عَلَم الزيدية الأكبر، عن أبيه محمد بن منصور المؤيدي، عن الإمام محمد بن القاسم الحوثي، عن الإمام محمد بن عبد الله الوزير، عن أحمد بن يوسف زبارة، عن الحسين بن يوسف زبارة، عن يوسف بن الحسين زبارة، عن الحسين بن أحمد بن صالح بن أبي الرجال، عن المتوكل على الله إسماعيل بن القاسم، عن الإمام القاسم بن محمد به.

الرابعة: عن السيد العلامة حمود بن عباس المؤيد، عن الشيخ عبد الواسع الواسعي، عن القاضي محمد بن عبد الله الغالبي، عن أبيه عبد الله بن علي الغالبي، عن محمد بن عبد الرب بن محمد، عن عمه إسماعيل بن محمد بن زيد، عن أبيه محمد بن زيد المتوكل، عن أبيه زيد المتوكل، عن أبيه المتوكل على الله إسماعيل بن القاسم، عن الإمام القاسم بن محمد به.

الخامسة: عن السيد حمود بن عباس المؤيد، عن محمد بن علي الشرفي، عن الإمام محمد ابن القاسم الحوثي، عن الإمام محمد بن عبد الله الوزير، عن أحمد بن يوسف زبارة، عن الحسين بن يوسف زبارة، عن يوسف بن الحسين زبارة، عن الحسين بن أحمد زبارة، عن أحمد بن صالح بن أبي الرجال، عن المتوكل على الله إسماعيل بن القاسم، عن الإمام القاسم بن محمد.

السادسة: عن السيد العلامة محمد بن الحسن العجري، عن السيد العلامة علي بن محمد العجري، عن السيد العلامة عبد الله بن يحيى العجري، عن الإمام المهدي محمد بن القاسم الحوثي، به.

السابعة: عن السيد العلامة محمد بن الحسن العجري، عن الوالد العلامة علي بن محمد العجري، والوالد العلامة الحسن بن عبد الله القاسمي، عن العلامة يحيى بن صلاح ستين، والعلامة عبد الله بن الحسن القاسمي، عن القاضي محمد بن علي الغالبي، عن أبيه، به.

الثامنة: عن السيد العلامة بدر الدين بن أمير الدين الحوثي، عن العلامة أحمد بن محمد القاسمي، عن الإمام الحسن بن يحيى القاسمي، عن العلامة عبد الله بن أحمد المؤيدي، عن القاضي عبد الله بن علي الغالبي، بإسناده المتقدم إلى الإمام القاسم بن محمد، به.

التاسعة: عن السيد العلامة محمد بن محمد المنصور، عن القاضي عبد الله بن عبد الكريم الجرافي، عن حسين العمري، عن أحمد بن محمد الكبسي، عن القاضي عبد الله بن علي الغالبي به.

العاشرة: عن السيد العلامة محمد بن يحيى بن المطهر، عن الشيخ عبد الواسع

Caption

2. Masāʾil al-Imāmah by Jaʿfar ibn Ḥarb

The attribution of this book is as below[57]

Josef van Ess, a prominent German Orientalist scholar of Islam, publicized in the German Institute of Beirut two Muʿtazilī texts which he attributed to the Ismāʿīlī Abbasid poet al-Nāshiʾal-Akbar (d. 293 AH / 906 CE). He named them "*Masāʾil al-Imāmah wa Muqtaṭafāt min al-Kitāb al-Awsaṭ fī al-Maqālāt".*

However, highly renowned scholar on Ismailism - Wilfred Madelung - instead attributes the text to Jaʿfar ibn Ḥarb. Meaning, the text is from the beginning of the 3rd century AH - not towards its end. This is something indicated by the text itself, as explained in point #3 of section 1 - which suggests it was written during the time of Imām al-Riḍā (d. 202 AH / 818 CE).

This conclusion were also made by other Orientalist scholars such as Sebastian Gunther and Maher Jarrar - that the texts were written by Jaʿfar ibn Ḥarb (d. 236 AH / 850 CE), the Muʿtazilīscholar of Baghdad. While it is asserted that the link of *Masāʾil al-Imāmah* with al-Nāshiʾal-Akbar is a mere claimed attribution.[58]

---

[57]Taḥqīq of al-Qāḍīʿ Abduljabbār's al-Mughnī, as evident in footnote https://books.google.com/books?id=4JZLDwAAQBAJ&pg=PT7#v=onepage&q&f=false

[58] Doctrinal Instruction in Early Islam, by Maher Jarrar and Sebastian Gunther. "Masāʾil al-Imāmah - by Jaʿfar ibn Ḥarb, attributed to al-Nāshiʾ" https://books.google.fr/books?id=J3znDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA331

1.Proving the Imamate of Imām ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Sajjād:

Before demonstrating the evidence for Imām al-Sajjād's Imamate, I will demonstrate my pretense for doing so from Shīʿī aḥādīth at first from al-Kāfī:

1. "Abī ʿAbdillāh [al-Ṣādiq] said: The example of the weapon with us is like the casket in Banū Israel. For Banū Israel, any house in which the casket was found on their door - it would be confirmed that they were given Prophethood.

Whomever is given the weapon [of Rasūl Allāh] in us, he is given the Imamate"

باب) * (أن مثل سلاح رسول الله مثل التابوت في بني إسرائيل) 1 - عدة من أصحابنا ، عن أحمد بن محمد ، عن علي بن الحكم ، عن معاوية ابن وهب عن سعيد السمان قال : سمعت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام يقول : إنما مثل السلاح فينا مثل التابوت في بني إسرائيل ، كانت بنو إسرائيل أي أهل بيت وجد التابوت على بابهم أوتوا النبوة فمن صار إليه السلاح منا أوتي الإمامة[59]

[59] Al-Kāfī, volume 1, page 238

2. “*Abī ʿAbdillāh al-Ṣādiq said:*

The master of this matter [i.e, the Imām] is known by three traits which are not present in a person other than him:

He is more worthy of the people of his predecessor (Imām) and he is his trustee [i.e, successor].

He has the weapon of Rasūl Allāh

He has the will of Rasūl Allāh

And those are in my possession - and no one disputes me in them.”

يعرف صاحب هذا الامر بثلاث خصال لا تكون في غيره : هو أولى الناس بالذين قبله وهو وصيه ، وعنده سلاح رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله ووصيته وذلك عندي ، لا أنازع فيه **60**

These Shīʿī aḥādīth indicate whomever has Rasūl Allāh’s weapon is the legitimate, divinely appointed successor to Rasūl Allāh and is the Imām.

Logically speaking, this would make sense. As a comparison, if I were a ruler and I had even the hair of Rasūl Allāh - I would use it to claim legitimacy from him.

[60] Al-Kāfī, volume 1, page 379

So what if I inherited the weapon of Rasūl Allāh, it is in my possession, and no one disputes me in them - as the ḥadīth describes Imām al-Ṣādiq?

This would be an evident indicator of legitimacy to be the successor to Rasūl Allāh.

Can we find something similar in authentic Sunnīaḥādīth?
The following ḥadīth in ***Ṣahīḥ al-Bukhārī*** indicates so:

"***Narrated ʿAlī ibn Al-Ḥusayn:***

That when they reached Medina after returning from Yazīd ibn Muʿāwiyya after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn ibnʿAlī (may Allāh bestow His Mercy upon him), Al-Miswar ibn Makhrama met him and said to him, "Do you have any need you may order me to satisfy?" ʿAlī said, "No." Al-Miswar said, ***Will you give me the sword of Allāh's Messenger (ﷺ) for I am afraid that people may take it from you by force? By Allāh, if you give it to me, they will never be able to take it till I die."***

حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْجَرْمِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا يَعْقُوبُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبِي أَنَّ الْوَلِيدَ بْنَ كَثِيرٍ، حَدَّثَهُ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَمْرِو بْنِ حَلْحَلَةَ الدُّؤَلِيِّ، حَدَّثَهُ أَنَّ ابْنَ شِهَابٍ حَدَّثَهُ أَنَّ عَلِيَّ بْنَ حُسَيْنٍ حَدَّثَهُ أَنَّهُمْ، حِينَ قَدِمُوا الْمَدِينَةَ مِنْ عِنْدِ يَزِيدَ بْنِ مُعَاوِيَةَ مَقْتَلَ حُسَيْنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ لَقِيَهُ الْمِسْوَرُ بْنُ مَخْرَمَةَ فَقَالَ لَهُ هَلْ لَكَ إِلَىَّ مِنْ حَاجَةٍ تَأْمُرُنِي بِهَا فَقُلْتُ لَهُ لاَ. فَقَالَ لَهُ فَهَلْ أَنْتَ مُعْطِيَّ سَيْفَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَإِنِّي أَخَافُ أَنْ يَغْلِبَكَ الْقَوْمُ عَلَيْهِ، وَايْمُ اللَّهِ، لَئِنْ أَعْطَيْتَنِيهِ لاَ يُخْلَصُ إِلَيْهِمْ أَبَدًا حَتَّى تُبْلَغَ نَفْسِي، إِنَّ عَلِيَّ بْنَ أَبِي طَالِبٍ خَطَبَ ابْنَةَ أَبِي جَهْلٍ عَلَى فَاطِمَةَ ـ عَلَيْهَا السَّلاَمُ ـ فَسَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَخْطُبُ النَّاسَ فِي ذَلِكَ عَلَى مِنْبَرِهِ هَذَا وَأَنَا يَوْمَئِذٍ مُحْتَلِمٌ فَقَالَ " إِنَّ فَاطِمَةَ مِنِّي، وَأَنَا أَتَخَوَّفُ أَنْ تُفْتَنَ فِي دِينِهَا ". ثُمَّ

ذَكَرَ صِهْرًا لَهُ مِنْ بَنِي عَبْدِ شَمْسٍ، فَأَثْنَى عَلَيْهِ فِي مُصَاهَرَتِهِ إِيَّاهُ قَالَ " حَدَّثَنِي فَصَدَقَنِي، وَوَعَدَنِي فَوَفَى لِي، وَإِنِّي لَسْتُ أُحَرِّمُ حَلاَلاً وَلاَ أُحِلُّ حَرَامًا، وَلَكِنْ وَاللَّهِ لاَ تَجْتَمِعُ بِنْتُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَبِنْتُ عَدُوِّ اللَّهِ أَبَدًا [61]

It seems from the ḥadīth that Imām al-Ḥusayn’s sword was that of Rasūl Allāh - and Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn inherited it from the Imām, after the Battle of Karbalāʾ. Upon which al-Miswar ibn Makhrama asked Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn to give him the sword so that he (al-Miswar) protects it.

The fact Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn inherited the sword of Rasūl Allāh from Imām al-Ḥusayn - proves that the Imamate of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya is invalid from a Shīʿī perspective. And proves Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn was a divinely appointed Imām.

2. The book of ʿAlī

The following Shīʿī ḥadīth from *al-Amālī* by Shaykh al-Ṣadūq:

“***Allāh revealed upon his Prophet a book before his death.***

*So he [Gabriel] said: ‘**O Muḥammad, this is a book to your will to the najīb (the distinguished man) from your family’.***

[61] Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 3110 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:3110

He [the Prophet] said: ***And who is the distinguished man from my family, O Gabriel?***

He [Gabriel] said: ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib."

قال : إن الله عز وجل أنزل على نبيه (صلى الله عليه وآله) كتابا قبل أن يأتيه أهلك . فقال : ومن مد ، هذا الكتاب وصيتك إلى النجيب من الموت ، فقال : يا مد النجيب من أهلي ، يا جبرئيل ؟ فقال : علي بن أبي طالب**[62]**

Interestingly enough - the following Bukhārī ḥadīth indicates there may have been speculation or hearsay that the Prophet gave such a book as a will to Imāmʿ Alī.

Perhaps, this may corroborate the idea that the al-Amālī ḥadīth is incredibly early and may have basis.

"Abū Juḥayfa said, ***"I asked ʿAlī, 'Have you got any book (which has been revealed to the Prophet (ﷺ) apart from the Qurʾān)?'*** *ʿAlī replied, 'No, except Allāh's Book or the power of understanding which has been bestowed (by Allāh) upon a Muslim or what is (written) in this sheet of paper (with me).'*[63]

Imām ʿAlī answers Abū Juḥayfain the negative - perhaps as a form of taqiyya.

---

[62] Al-Amālī by Shaykh al-Ṣadūq page 486
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1134_الأمالي-الشيخ-الصدوق/الصفحة_484
[63]Ṣahīḥ al Bukhārī 111 https://sunnah.com/bukhari:111

3. The book of ʿAlī - The Supernatural

Per Twelver view, the mushaf compiled by Imāmʿ Alī has taʾwīl of the Qurʾān. Let us discuss this pretense in Twelver sources first.

Imāmʿ Alī narrates, as in Twelver sources such as Tafsīral-Burhān:

"No verse was revealed upon the Prophet except he recited to me and dictated its writing to me. So I would write it with my handwriting.

And he taught me its taʾwīl, tafsīr, abrogated verses, its muḥkam (established), and mutashābih(ambiguous) verses.
And he did duʿāʾto Allāh that he teaches me its understanding and memorization.

So I did not forget a single verse from the Book of Allāh. Nor a single piece of knowledge - which I had written down all from the time he did dua to me."

ما نزلت آية على رسول الله إلا أقرأنيها و أملاها علي ، فأكتبها بخطي . و علمني تأويلها و تفسيرها و ناسخها ومنسوخها و محكمها و متشابهها . ودعا الله لي أن يعلمني فهمها و حفظها ، فما نسيت آية من كتاب الله ، و لا علما أملاه علي فكتبته منذ دعا لي ما دعا[64]

[64]Tafsīr al-Burhān, volume 1, page 16

This muṣḥaf of the Qurʾān in Imāmʿ Alī’s presence, had taʾwīl which showed events from the future, as this al-Kāfī ḥadīth indicates:

“*I heard Abī ʿAbdillāh [al-Ṣādiq] say:*

Rasūl Allāh gave birth to me (spiritually), and since then I have had knowledge of the Book of Allāh.

And in it [i.e, Allāh’s book] is the beginning of creations, and the events that will occur until the Day of Judgement. And in it has knowledge of the heavens and earth, heaven and hell, and knowledge of what happened and will happen.”

سمعت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام يقول قد ولدني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وأنا أعلم كتاب الله وفيه بدء الخلق ، وما هو كائن إلى يوم القيامة ، وفيه خبر السماء وخير الأرض ، وخبر الجنة وخبر النار ، وخبر ما كان ، و [خبر] ما هو كائن ، أعلم ذلك كما أنظر إلى " كفي ، إن الله يقول : " فيه تبيان كل شئ[65]

Whenever Imām al-Ṣādiq would seek knowledge of events in the future, he would open the Book of Imāmʿ Alī (the muṣḥaf which in its taʾwīl reveals the future).

Books of Imāmʿ Alī with insight into the future such as al-Jafr, may be as well be a part of the taʾwīl of the Qurʾān.

The book of ʿAlī (Qurʾān tafsīr and taʾwīl) may have normal tafsīr of the dhahir of the Qurʾān:

[65] Al-Kāfī, vol 1, page 61

عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام أنه قال : في كتاب علي عليه السلام في قول الله عز وجل : " وما علمتم من الجوارح مكلبين (2) " قال : هي الكلاب(1)[66]

"*Abī ʿAbdillāh [al-Ṣādiq] said:*

***In the book of ʿAlī,** there is [tafsīr] of the verse 'Say, "Lawful for you are [all] good foods and [game caught by] what you have trained of hunting animals'.*

He [al-Ṣādiq] said: (Hunting animals mentioned here) are dogs'"

Yet, there is also taʾwīlgiving knowledge of the future:

"*Abī Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] said:*

*'**We have found in the book of ʿAlī,** that Rasūl Allāh said:*

If Zināincreases after my death, so will unexpected deaths (increase).'

4 - محمد بن يحيى ، عن أحمد بن محمد ، عن ابن محبوب ، عن مالك بن عطية ، عن أبي عبيدة عن أبي جعفر (عليه السلام) قال : وجدنا في كتاب علي (عليه السلام) قال رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) : إذا كثر الزنا من بعدي كثر موت الفجأة. [67]

—

[66] Al-Kāfī, vol 6, page 202

[67] Al-Kāfī, Vol 5, Page 541

Evidence from Zaydī sources

Thus, Imām al-Ṣādiq being in possession of the Book of ʿAlī to ascertain events in the future would be proof of his Imamate.

This premise is present in Twelver sources, such as Uṣūl al-Kāfī below:

“I told Abī ʿAbdillāh:

‘The Zaydiyya and Muʿtazila gathered around Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh [ibn al-Ḥasan], so does he have authority?’

He [the Imām] said:

‘By Allāh, I have with me two books in which every prophet and every king ruling the Earth is mentioned. By Allāh, I did not find Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh [ibn al-Ḥasan] present in either book.”

7 – علي بن إبراهيم، عن أبيه، عن ابن أبي عمير، عن عمر بن أذينة، عن فضيل بن يسار وبريد بن معاوية وزرارة أن عبد الملك بن أعين قال لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام:
إن الزيدية والمعتزلة قد أطافوا بمحمد بن عبد الله (1) فهل له سلطان؟ فقال: و الله إن عندي لكتابين فيهما تسمية كل نبي وكل ملك يملك الأرض، لا والله ما محمد بن عبد الله في واحد منهما.[68]

[68] Al-Kāfī, vol 1, page 242
http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/الكتب/1122_الكافي-الشيخ-الكليني-ج-١/الصفحة_290

Intriguingly, this is also evident in Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn by highly prominent Zaydī historian and poet, Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī:

1. "*Whenever Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad would see Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, his eyes would be filled with tears and then he would say:*

'May I be sacrificed for him, the people are saying he is the Mahdī and he will be killed. ***However, he is not found in the Book of ʿAlī to be among the caliphs of this ummah."***

كان جعفر بن محمد إذا رأى محمد بن عبد الله تغرغرت عيناه ، ثم يقول : بنفسي هوا إن الناس ليقولون فيه أنه المهدي وأنه لمقتول ! ليس هذا في كتاب علي من خلفاء هذه الأمة[69]

The narration I am citing has 5 different Zaydī chains, thus highly corroborating the incident.

"ʿ*Umar ibn ʿAbdullāh al-ʿAtakī narrated to me, from ʿUmar ibn Shabba, from al-Faḍlibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Hāshimī and ibn Dājah"*

"Abū Zayd, from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAmrū ibn Jabla, from al-Ḥasan ibn Ayyūb mawlā of Banī Numayr, from ʿAb dal-Aʿlā ibn Aʿyan"

[69]Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn, page 142

“Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Kirām al-Jaʿfarī from his father”

“Muḥammad ibn Yaḥya and ʿĪsā ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī also narrated it to me.”

أخبرني عمر بن عبد الله العتكي قال : حدثنا عمر بن شبة قال : حدثنا الفضل ابن عبد الرحمن الهاشمي وابن داجة . قال أبو زيد : وحدثني عبد الرحمن بن عمرو ابن جبلة قال : حدثني الحسن بن أيوب مولى بني نمير عن عبد الأعلى بن أعين قال وحدثني أبيه . وحدثني محمد بن يحيى وحدثني إبراهيم بن محمد بن أبي الكرام الجعفري عن أبيه . وحدثني عيسى بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عمر بن علي

2. “*And Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad came to ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Ḥasan who welcomed him.*

Jaʿfar told him: ‘Do not perform this [revolt], as it is not the right time for this matter.

If you - ʿAbdullāh - see that this son of yours is the Mahdī, then he is not it nor is it this his time.

But if you wished to make him revolt for out of anger for the sake of Allāh, to enjoin the good and prohibit the false, then by Allāh we will not let you (go alone) - and you are our shaykh and we give bayʿah to your son.”

قالوا : وجاء جعفر بن محمد الصادق فأوسع له عبد الله بن الحسن إلى جنبه ، فتكلم بمثل كلامه فقال جعفر الصادق] : « لا تفعلوا فإن هذا الأمر لم يأت بعد ، إن كنت ترى الله - أن ابنك هذا هو المهدي ، فليس به ولا هذا أوانه ، وإن كنت

إنما تريد يعني عبد أن تخرجه غضبا لله ، وليأمر بالمعروف وينهى عن المنكر ، فإنا والله لا ندعك وأنت شيخنا . « ونبايع ابنك[70]

The first ḥadīth is clear that Imām al-Ṣādiq’s statement that Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh (al-Nafs al-Zakiyya) will not be a ruler, based on the Imām’s possession of the supernatural Book of ʿAlī.

And the Imām’s statement regarding Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh not being the Mahdī is seemingly also derived from the Book of ʿAlī - or else under what pretext would the Imām say it is not time for the Mahdī and that Muḥammadibn ʿAbdullāh is not the Mahdī?

There must be an eschatological connotation to Mahdihood, otherwise simply by revolting - Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh will become a Mahdī and Imām al-Ṣādiq would not object.

Rather, Imām al-Ṣādiq is claiming secret knowledge (from the Book of ʿAlī) which gives him insight that ʿAbdullāh is not the Mahdī - and not a person who will ever rule.

Imām al-Ṣādiq then offers bayʿah to ʿAbdullāh’s son Muḥammad - out of taqiyya, shyness. Similar to how his father al-Bāqir if permitted the Shīʿa to fight Zayd ibn ʿAlī - the Shīʿa would consider it to be taqiyya and would not rise with Zayd, as they would know it is out of taqiyya. As discussed in point 9.

---

[70] Ibid, Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn, page 108

—

4. Imām al-Kāẓim receiving khums money

“ʿAlī ibn Ismāʿīl [ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq] left until he entered upon Yaḥya ibn Khālid al-Barmakī (vizier of Hārūn al-Rashīd) who learned from him the news of Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar and then introduced him (ʿAlī) to al-Rashīd.

Then he brought him (ʿAlī) to al-Rashīd who asked him (ʿAlī) about his uncle (Hārūn ibn Jaʿfar), and he (ʿAlī) reported him (Mūsā).

He told Yaḥya of all of Mūsā’s news, and even more, saying:

Money comes to him (Mūsā) from the East and West. And he has entire treasuries in his possession. In fact, he made a purchase costing 30,000 dinars and he called it ‘a small purchase’...

Al-Rashīd did Ḥajj in this year and began reciting near the grave of Rasūl Allāh:

‘O Rasūl Allāh, I apologize to you from something I am about to do. I want to imprison Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar, as he seeks dissension in your ummah and to shed its blood”.

فخرج علي بن إسماعيل حتى اتى يحيى بن خالد البرمكي ، فتعرف منه خبر موسى بن جعفر ، فعرفه إلى الرشيد وزاد فيه ، ثم أوصله إلى الرشيد فسأله عن

عمه فسعى به إليه ، فعرف يحيى جميع خبره وزاد عليه وقال له : إن الأموال تحمل إليه من المشرق والمغرب . وإن له بيوت أموال ، وانه اشترى ضيعة بثلاثين ألف دينار فسماها اليسيرة ، وقال له صاحبها وقد أحضره المال : لا أخذ هذا النقد ولا آخذ إلا نقدا كذا وكذا ، فأمر بذلك المال فرد وأعطاه ثلاثين ألف دينار من النقد الذي سأل بعينه ، فسمع ذلك منه الرشيد وامر له بمائتي ألف درهم نسبت له على بعض النواحي ، فاختار كور المشرق ، ومضت رسله لقبض المال . ودخل هو في بعض الأيام إلى الخلاء فزحر زحرة فخرجت حشوته كلها فسقطت ، وجهدوا في ردها فلم يقدروا ، فوقع لما به ، وجاءه المال وهو ينزع فقال : وما اصنع به وانا موت ؟! وحج الرشيد في تلك السنة فبدأ بقبر النبي صلى الله عليه وآله فقال : يا رسول الله إني اعتذر إليك من شئ أريد أن أفعله أريد أن أحبس موسى بن جعفر ، فإنه يريد التشتت بين أمتك وسفك دمائها[71]

Evaluation:

The purpose of khums money by our Imāms was to create a state within a state. To maintain the independence of the Shīʿīstatelet from the Abbasid state.

It will theoretically give our Imāms the financial capability of growing their own armies, purchasing the loyalty of the Abbasid inner circle, and even carving out their own actual states.
This is why Hārūn compared Imām al-Kāẓim’skhums collection with causing dissension among Muslims and shedding their blood - as al-Kāẓim’s actions will only lead to bloody conflict with the Abbasid State.

[71] Ibid, Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn, page 334

Particularly since al-Kāẓim accumulated extremely large amounts of money on a regular basis from his followers.

5. Zaydī Imām contemporary of Imām al-Hādī criticizing Imām al-Hādī

Al-Qāsim al-Rassī, the Zaydī Imām, continues saying (from section 1 point 12):

'Have you seen in him [i.e, ʿAlī al-Hādī] what you saw in Rasūl Allāh from asceticism / lack of luxury?

If they [Rāfiḍa] say "yes", ask them:

'Have we seen him better the situation of any of you or change his [bad] state?

And we have seen from him [al-Hādī] actions that are not proper for neither a prophet nor a believer, and we are shy from mentioning in our book?[72] *'*

Evaluation:

To understand this statement, I will have to requote some points from point 5 of section 1:

Al-Qāsim al-Rassī says:

---

[72]Majmūʿ Rasāʾil al-Qāsim al-Rassī, page 563

“*Has anyone appeared from among the prophets or Imāms or dāʿīs to Allāh -* ***such as ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, or Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī - and others whom called to Allāh and we did not differ on them being Imāms? And Allāh awarded them that status?***

Had they asked people what they did not deserve from people’s money?

Had they publicized disobedience by the cover of ***taqiyya****? To protect themselves, and out of fear of their blood being shed?”*

My Evaluation:

It is evident that the Zaydī Imām saw shared points with the Rāfiḍa on several Imāms - such ʿAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī.

It is worth noting that ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn and Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī are not recognized as Imāms by the Zaydiyya today.

Additionally, al-Rassī mentions “others whom called to Allāh and we did not differ on them being Imāms” - after speaking of Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī being a shared Imām with the Rāfiḍa.

The figure al-Rassī was referring to by “others whom called to Allāh” perhaps refers to Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq,

or al-Kāẓim - whom the Zaydiyya refer to claim were in fact rebellious leaders.

Al-Rassī was not the only one to recognize some of the later Twelver Imāms as Zaydī Imāms. Later Zaydī Imāms recognized Imām ʿAlī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā as an Imām, as evident by the testimony of their Imāmal-Manṣūr Billāhʿ Abdullāh ibn Ḥamza.

—

It is evident that al-Qāsim al-Rassī sees the first 7th Imāms of the Qaṭʿiyya as righteous.

Thus, when he uses their examples along with the word صاحبكم(your master) - he is doing so to emphasize the true beliefs of these figures is distinct from the Rāfiḍa / Qaṭʿiyya.

However, his stance changes from Imām al-Riḍā until al-Hādī, as his positive stance is only on the Imāms whom the Zaydiyya (of al-Rassī’s time) do not differ in.

Comparing the later Imāms of the Qaṭʿiyya with earlier ones, he says:

“***Had they asked people what they did not deserve from people’s money?***

Had they publicized disobedience by the cover of ***taqiyya****? To protect themselves, and out of fear of their blood being shed?”*

As part of this criticism of the later Imāms, al-Qāsim al-Rassī uses Qur'anic style of language to indicate he has physically seen Imām al-Hādī's 'wretched' actions.

Al-Rassī says:

وقد رأينا منه أفاعيل ل يجوز ان تكون في نبي ول في مؤمن ونستحيي اننذكرها في كتابنا

And we have seen from him [al-Hādī] actions that are not proper for neither a prophet nor a believer, and we are shy from mentioning in our book?'

وقدرأينا'WaQadRa͗aynā'

When the Qur͗ān uses the phrase 'QadNarā' ('Narā' being a form to see, like Ra͗aynā) - it means undoubtful certain witnessing of something.

Allāh says in 2:144:

We have certainly seen قدنرى*the turning of your face, [O Muḥammad], toward the heaven,*

Thus, al-Qāsim al-Rassīis claiming to have physically - without doubt - witnessed al-Hādī commit these wicked actions.

Now brothers and sisters, my purpose of mentioning this accusation by the Zaydī Imām against Imām al-Hādī, is not because I find it credible.

But because it confirms what we know about Imām al-Hādī, but from a highly polemical point of view of a theological opponent who aims to discredit Imām al-Hādī.

Hence, the author claiming "*We have seen from him actions that are not proper for a prophet nor believer … and we are shy from mentioning in our book*".

Your theological opponent (especially a spiritual leader of another sect) would always claim you (another religious leader) use the money you collect from your followers improperly.

For example, if an atheist saw Prophet Muḥammad controlling 20% of warbooty khums - he would make a similar accusation against Prophet Muḥammad which is completely baseless.

6. Imām al-Ḥusayn claiming divinely appointed Imamate

As mentioned previously in Section 1, Abū Mikhnaf has a very prominent role as a historian in Ṭabarī's historia.

If one sees accusations of Tashayyuʿ against him as not affecting his work, similar to the Tashayyuʿaccusations against Ibn Isḥāq.

And his weakness in ḥadīth (per Sunnī standards) does not make his historical works unreliable, also similar to Ibn Isḥāq.

Then one can take upon the following narration in which Imām Ḥusayn claims divine appointment as successor to Prophet Muḥammad - with which he will save the people from innovations which his caliph predecessors set forth

According to Hishām (Muḥammad al-Kalbī)—Abū Mikhnaf al-Saqʿab b. Zuhayr AbūʿUthmān al-Nahdi:

"Ḥusayn wrote a letter to the Baṣrans with a mawlā of his (family's called Sulaymān). It was written in one copy but addressed to the heads of the five divisions in al-Baṣrah and to the nobles: it was written to Mālik b. Mismaʿ al-Bakrī, al-Aḥnaf b. Qays, al-Mundhir b. al-Jārūd, Masʿūd b. ʿAmr, Qays b. al-Haytham, and ʿUmar b. ʿUbaydallāh b. Maʿmar.

A single copy of it was given to all the [Baṣran) nobles (which was as follows):

"God gave preference to Muḥammad before all His creatures. He graced him with prophethood and chose him for his message. After he had warned His servants and informed them of what he had been sent with, God took him to Himself. ***We are his family, those who possess his authority (awliyāʾ), those who have been made his successors - trustees awṣiyāʾ), and his***

inheritors; we are those who have more right to his position among the people than anyone else. Our people selfishly claimed our exclusive right to that. Yet we consented (to what they did) since we hated disunion and desired the well-being of the community). However, we know that we have greater claim to that right, which was our entitlement, than those who have seized it. *They have done well, set many things right, and sought truth. May God have mercy on them and forgive us and them. I have sent my messenger to you with this letter. I summon you to the Book of God, the Sunnah of his Prophet.* ***Indeed the Sunnah has (almost] been killed while innovation has been given life. If you hear my words and obey my commands, I will guide you along the path of righteousness.***

Peace and the mercy of God be with you."

قال أبو مخنف حدثني الصقعب بن زهير عن أبي عثمان النهدي قال كتب حسين مع مولى لهم يقال له سليمان وكتب بنسخة إلى رؤس الأخماس بالبصرة وإلى الاشراف فكتب إلى مالك بن مسمع البكري وإلى الأحنف بن قيس وإلى المنذر بن الجارود وإلى مسعود بن عمرو وإلى قيس بن الهيثم وإلى عمرو بن عبيد الله بن معمر فجاءت منه نسخة واحدة إلى جميع أشرافها أما بعد فان الله اصطفى محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم على خلقه وأكرمه بنبوته واختاره لرسالته ثم قبضه الله إليه وقد نصح لعبادة وبلغ ما أرسل به صلى الله عليه وسلم وكنا أهله وأولياءه وأوصياءه وورثته وأحق الناس بمقامه في الناس فاستأثر علينا قومنا بذلك فرضينا وكرهنا الفرقة وأحببنا العافية ونحن نعلم أنا أحق بذلك الحق المستحق علينا ممن تولاه وقد أحسنوا وأصلحوا وتحروا الحق فرحمهم الله وغفر لنا ولهم وقد بعثت رسولي إليكم بهذا الكتاب وأنا أدعوكم إلى كتاب الله وسنة نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم فان السنة قد أميتت وإن البدعة قد أحييت وأن تسمعوا قولي وتطيعوا أمري أهدكم سبيل الرشاد والسلام عليكم ورحمة[73]

[73]Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, volume 4, page 265

Historicity of Shīʿī Core Beliefs

Historicity of core Shīʿī beliefs such as infallibility, badāʾ, paying khums to the Imāms, etc was outlined in section 1.

Other concepts shall be outlined below:

1. Takfīr al-Ṣaḥāba

- Al-Intṣār by Al-Khayyāṭ al-Muʿtazilī (d. 933 CE)

Written in the era of al-Ghayba al-Ṣughrā, it confirms some intrinsic aspects of Shi'ism was wholly crystallized.

Al-Khayyāṭ states, *"Al-Jāhiẓ knew that the Rāfiḍa did not perform takfīr on ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, al-Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Salmān, al-Miqdād with 3 or 4 of the Ṣaḥāba.*

But what is reported of them is that they perform takfīron the Muhājirīnand Anṣār, except 5 or 6 individuals.

This is their known, mashhūr (popular) saying".[74]

---

[74] Al-Intiṣār, page 138

Taʾwīl Mukhtalaf al-Ḥadīth by Ibn Qutayba (d. 889 CE)

"This [ḥadīth] is hujja for the Rawāfiḍin their takfīrof the companions of the Prophet except ʿAlī, Abī Dharr, al-Miqdād, Salmān, ʿAmmār ibn Yāsir, and Ḥudhayfa" [75]

Kitāb al-Sunnah by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal(d. 855 CE)

"*They are those who disassociate from the companions of Muḥammad, and insult them, and diminish [their status/character], and they do takfir on all the Imāms (i.e, Ṣaḥāba) except four:*

ʿAlī, ʿAmmār, Miqdād, andSalmān. Indeed, the Rāfiḍa have nothing to do with Islam in any way." [76]

2. Sabb al-Ṣaḥāba

Kitāb al-Sunnah by ʿAbdullāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 903 CE)

"I asked my father: who are the Rāfiḍa?

[75] Taʾwīl Mukhtalaf al-Ḥadīth, page 217
[76] Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's Kitāb al-Sunnah, page 82

He (Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal) said: Those who insult AbūBakr and ʿUmar" **[77]**

3. Batinism

Ṣahīḥ Muslim by Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj(d. 875 CE)

Salamah ibn Shabīb narrated to me, al-Ḥumaydī narrated to us, Sufyān narrated to us, he said, I heard a man ask Jābir about the verse:

{Thus I will never depart from the land until my father permits me or Allāh decides for me, and He is the best of Judges}[Yūsuf: 80]. Jābir said: 'An interpretation has not come to me about these [verses]'. Sufyān said: 'He lied'. We said to Sufyān: 'What did he mean by this?' [Sufyān] said: 'Indeed the Rāfiḍah say, "ʿAlī is in the clouds and we will not emerge along with he who will emerge from his children [the Khalīfah] until a caller calls from the heaven, meaning ʿAlī: 'Ride out along with so-and-so [meaning the promised Mahdī]'. Jābir said, 'that is an interpretation for these verses', and he would lie as they were regarding the brothers of Yūsuf, peace be upon him'. **[78]**

4. Religion is not possible except with an Imām

---

[77] ʿAbdullāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's Kitāb al-Sunnah, page 222

[78] Ṣahīḥ Muslim, Introduction, 58 https://sunnah.com/muslim/introduction/57

Ibn Baṭṭa al-Ḥanbalī (d. 997 CE) criticizes the Rāfiḍa saying:

“As for the Rāfiḍa, they are the most differing among the people, and the most to fight [each other].

Each one of them chooses a doctrine for himself that he curses those who disagree with him, and does takfīrthose who did not follow him, and all of them say: There is no prayer, no fasting, no jihād, no Friday, no two festivals, no marriage, no divorce, and no Selling, nor buying except with an imām, and he who does not have an Imām has no religion, and whoever does not know his imām has no religion.”

وأما الرافضة فأشد الناس اختلافا وتباينا وتطاعنا ، فكل واحد منهم يختار مذهبا لنفسه يلعن من خالفه عليه ، ويكفر من لم يتبعه ، وكلهم يقول : إنه لا صلاة ، ولا صيام ، ولا جهاد ، ولا جمعة ، ولا عيدين ، ولا نكاح ، ولا طلاق ، ولا بيع ، ولا شراء إلا بإمام ، وإنه من لا إمام له فلا دين له ، ومن لم يعرف إمامه فلا دين له

79

[79]Al-Ibāna by Ibn Baṭṭa, volume 2, page 8

Epilogue

It becomes clear from the discussed passages that the idea of Naṣṣ Imamate is not a later innovation, nor were the beliefs associated with it regarding the Imāms innovated later on.

It would seem that the conceptions of the Imāms by the Twelver Shīʿa, existed very much early on. Remarkably earlier than the average person would be inclined to believe.

The Twelver Imāms seemed to have regarded themselves as divinely appointed Imāms of the Shīʿa, exercised actions reflective of this position, and were evidently seen by at least some of their contemporaries as having this position and criticized for it.

It also seems there is evidence to in fact support the idea that these figures were genuinely Imāms appointed by Allāh.

May Allāh and the Ahl al-Bayt accept this book as a deed to benefit us in dunyā and ākhira.

May Allāh bless you all.

Wassalām.